

SCP
R 46,789

AN ESSAY,

ON

THE PROPER RENDERING OF THE WORDS

ELOHIM AND *elohim*

INTO THE CHINESE LANGUAGE..

BY

WILLIAM J. BOONE, D. D.

MISSIONARY BISHOP OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH
OF THE UNITED STATES TO CHINA.

17
In Chinese Repository v. 17

CANTON:

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE CHINESE REPOSITORY.

1848.

DEDICATION,

To

The President and Directors of the British and Foreign Bible Society,

The President and Directors of the American Bible Society.

And to

The Protestant Missionaries in China.

DEAR BRETHREN :

I take the liberty of addressing this Essay to you in preference to the public. It is on a subject about which the public in general will feel but little concern, but in which, you on the contrary, from your position and from the responsibilities which that position brings with it, will feel a deep and peculiar interest. I need here say nothing of the importance of the subject discussed, as nothing I can say would increase your sense thereof; but, as the most suitable introduction to the subject I can offer, I will give a short narrative of the circumstances which have led to this discussion, that you may understand the present position of affairs, with respect to the translation now preparing and appreciate the better what you may read on either side of this controversy.

The translations made by Drs. Morrison and Milne, by Dr. Marshman, Dr. Medhurst and Mr. Gutzlaff respectively, each failing to secure the approbation of all parties concerned, the Protestant Missionaries to China, at a meeting held in Hongkong, August 22d 1843, resolved to unite in the endeavor to produce a

revised version, hoping to obtain for this version the approbation and support of the Bible Societies in Great Britain and America. The plan proposed embraced all the Protestant Missionaries: these were divided into five sub-committees, to each of which different portions of the New Testament were committed for revision. It was also agreed, that, when these sub-committees should have concluded their several portions, the whole work should be submitted for a final revision to a committee composed of Delegates from each of the sub-committees. The revision at the several stations was completed in the early part of 1847 and the Delegates from the sub-committees assembled in Shánghái in the month of June and entered upon their labors. The progress of their work was soon arrested by a difference of opinion with respect to the rendering of the word θεός, and this being, in the opinion of all, a matter of the greatest importance, the Delegates after a *viva voce* discussion of a few days, to secure greater accuracy in their investigations, carried on their discussion in writing. The careful examination of the points at issue, demanding a very extensive appeal to Chinese writers, this discussion lasted for five months and was conducted amicably by all parties, but unhappily without leading to unanimity of sentiment.

When the question, how shall the word θεός be rendered, was put to vote, two Delegates were in favor of using the word *Tí*, 帝, and two in favor of using *Shin*, 神. Being thus unable to determine this question, it only remained for the Delegates to decide, whether, they would proceed with their work, leaving the word θεός untranslated, or inform their Brethren in China and the Bible Societies in Great Britain and America that

they were unable to perform the task entrusted to them. They unanimously decided to pursue the course first mentioned, and are now daily engaged in the work of revision, leaving the word $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ untranslated.

This state of things has rendered it necessary for the Delegates, who maintain the different views above expressed, to appeal to the Missionaries in China—their constituents—and to the Bible Societies to whom they look for aid to publish the version when completed. The version when completed, will be the work of all, and the simple question for the Bible Societies to decide will be, whether their funds' shall be employed in circulating copies thereof in which the word $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ is rendered by *Shin* 神 or *Ti* 帝.

This difference of opinion in respect to the rendering of $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ is not of recent origin. Drs. Morrison, Milne and Marshman used *Shin* to render Elohim and $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in all cases. Dr. Medhurst and Mr. Gutzlaff used *Sháng Ti* 上帝, to render these words, when the true God was referred to, and *Shin* 神 when the reference was to a false god. At the meeting held at Hongkong in 1843, this subject was referred to a committee consisting of Drs. Medhurst and Legge, but they disagreeing, it was resolved to leave the question for the decision of the committee of Delegates. This committee have been unable to decide it and now refer it to the decision of their constituents and of the Bible Societies in Great Britain and America.

The question is one of the deepest moment; a mistake on this point affects almost every question in theology, especially our testimony against Polytheism and our teaching on the subject of the Trinity.

I think it right to state that, during the whole time

of this discussion, I have labored under a severe affection of the nervous system, rendering all mental effort extremely painful, and that nothing but an imperative sense of duty could have induced me, under these circumstances, to have taken any public part in this discussion. Allow me, then, to entreat those of my Brethren, who are blessed with health and upon whom the responsibility devolves of forming a decided opinion upon this important question, to give to the consideration of it their most earnest attention.


My most earnest prayer is that what I have written may aid you, Dear Brethren, in arriving at the correct conclusion, and that the Gracious Saviour will condescend to use it as a means to set forward his Blessed Gospel in China.

I am, Dear Brethren,

Faithfully Yours in the Gospel,

W. J. BOONE.

Shánghái, Jan. 27th, 1848.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

AN ESSAY

ON THE PROPER RENDERING OF THE WORDS ELOHIM
AND $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ INTO THE CHINESE LANGUAGE.

BY WILLIAM J. BOONE, D. D.

Missionary bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the U. S. to China.

A KNOWLEDGE of the Being and attributes of God must be regarded as the foundation of all acceptable worship. Without this knowledge the worshiper, instead of adoring the true God, may, when addressing his Deity, be worshipping a mere creature of his own imagination.

The chief object for which a revelation was given, we may suppose, was to supply this knowledge: to reveal the true God—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and to make known to man the gracious plan which this Triune God had adopted for his restoration and salvation. The word *God* is thus the most important that occurs in the Sacred Scriptures; for with this word is connected all the knowledge which is most important for man to know. “This is life eternal,” says our blessed Lord, “that they might know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.”

From these considerations, we are led to attach much importance to the term by which the word $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ shall be rendered in the revision of the translation of the New Testament, into the Chinese language, now preparing. We all know the importance of a name; the great influence it exercises either to aid or hinder us in forming correct conceptions of an object; and may, therefore, easily conceive how much the propagation of correct views of the true God may be furthered or hindered, in China, by the selection that may be made of the term to render $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$. We must, however, guard against expecting too much from this source; among a heathen people no word can be found which will convey, by the meaning which its previous *usus loquendi* has given it, just ideas of the true God. These ideas can be derived alone from the revelation He has made of Himself. This, as I have said above, is the most precious knowledge a translator communicates to the heathen in rendering the Word of God

into their language, and he must not expect to find this knowledge stored up in some word ready for his use. The possession of a correct knowledge of God is not, what the Christian teacher can expect to find among the heathen, at the commencement of his instructions; it is rather the goal, which he can only expect to reach after many days of painful labor. This being the case, the translation of the Scriptures, into the language of the Chinese, may be regarded as having for its highest aim the making them acquainted with the true God and the relations they sustain to him. It becomes then a matter of much importance to decide what their knowledge on this subject is, and what are the chief errors into which they have fallen: above all, to inquire, whether they are monotheists or polytheists? To this question there is but one response. The Chinese have been polytheists from the highest ages to which their history extends: the great enemy to be here beaten down is polytheism: the first great truth, with respect to the Divinity, to be taught them is, the Unity of the Godhead. Therefore,—

In rendering θεος, a translator, whilst he endeavors, in the selection of the term he makes, to take advantage of all the knowledge of Divinity in general that may exist among the Chinese, will be extremely careful lest Jehovah may be confounded with any one of their numberless Deities, and especially anxious to avail himself of the term that will prove most efficient in assailing polytheism.

Unhappily great difficulty has always been felt by Christian missionaries, in China, to agree upon a word by which to render *Elohim* and θεος. The Romish missionaries had formerly much controversy on this point; and now, alas, the Protestant missionaries find themselves divided in opinion on the same point. These facts would lead us to suppose that there must be some inherent difficulties in the case, arising either from the theology of the Chinese or from some peculiarity of their language. We shall see in the sequel, perhaps, to which to attribute it.

The decision which was made of this controversy, in the Romish church, is considered by Protestants rather a cutting of the knot than the untying of it: and, for reasons which will appear in a subsequent part of this Essay, none of them are disposed to unite with the Romanists in the term they have adopted.

The chief reason, that the inquiries on this point have not led to a result commanding general concurrence, appears to the writer to be the neglect, on the part of the various inquirers, to come to a definite understanding on the general question, how the difficulty,

arising from polytheism, is to be met. In consequence of the neglect to settle this previous question, they have wandered in the wide fields of Chinese literature without a definite object; the results of their several inquiries, though clashing, have not led to any distinct issue, and the question has remained undecided.

It is, however, surely of the utmost importance, in a case of this kind, at the very outset, to determine definitely *what* we shall seek for, before our minds become engaged in the examination of the multifarious evidence that may be submitted.

If it be admitted that the Chinese do not know the true God, (which we understand is admitted by all the Protestant missionaries,) then it appears to us one of two terms must be sought for: viz. either the name of the chief God of the Chinese, or the name by which the whole class of Gods is known in their language. We must either seek the name of the Being to whom they have ascribed the most glorious attributes; or, discarding this, we must use the generic name for God, i. e. the name of the highest class of *Beings* to whom the Chinese are in the habit of offering *religious worship*. There is no middle course between these two points: which of these two terms shall be sought for, is the previous general question, which should be definitely settled, if we wish our discussions to lead to a direct issue. It is manifest that two parties, the one of which is seeking for the name of the highest Being known to the Chinese, the other for the name of the highest *class* of Beings to whom the Chinese offer religious worship, are not likely to agree upon the same term as the result of their inquiries.

We shall, therefore, first discuss this general question. In translating the Scriptures into the language of a polytheistic nation, should the name of their chief God, or the generic name for God in their language, be used to render *Elohim* and θεος?

The following considerations have convinced us, that, in such a case, the generic name for God should be used; and that the use of the name of the chief Deity of any polytheistic nation to render *Elohim* would be wholly inadmissible.

1. *Elohim*, in the Old Testament, is not a proper name of the true God, but is a generic term, applied to heathen Deities as well as to Jehovah. It must therefore, be rendered by a generic term and not by a proper name.

2. In using the generic name for God, under the circumstances we are considering, a translator follows the example of the inspired men, who wrote in the Greek and Latin languages. The Greek

and Romans were polytheists : the inspired writers of the New Testament, and the Apostles who preached the gospel to the Greeks and Romans, were precisely in the same circumstances in which we are now seeking for a general rule to guide us in our inquiries. The question, then, how did they act under these circumstances, is one of great interest to us. It is well known that the Septuagint translators used *θεος* and not *Zeus* to render *Elohim* into Greek, and that the Apostles used the same term in the New Testament. The same course was pursued at Rome; the generic name was preferred to the name of the chief Deity : *Deus* was used, not *Jupiter*. If then a translator, engaged in rendering the Sacred Scriptures into the language of a polytheistic people, desires to follow the example of inspired men, he must employ the generic name for God used by them, and not the name of the chief Deity.

3. It is necessary to use the generic term for God, in order to render correctly the first Commandment, and many other parts of Scripture which forbid polytheism.

The First Commandment reads as follows : “ I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have none other Gods but me.” Let the reader substitute *Jupiter*, or the name of the chief God of any polytheistic system with which he is acquainted, for *God* in the first clause and *God* in the second, and he will see how completely the bearing of this Commandment, on polytheism, is nullified.

Again : Is. 45:5, “ I am the Lord, and there is none else ; there is no God beside me.” Is 44:8. “ Is there a God beside me ? Yea there is no God, I know not any.”

The object of these passages, and of the First Commandment, is to forbid men to put any trust, hope, or reliance in any but God and to direct them to Him as the *only* proper object of *religious worship*. Should the word *God*, in the passages above quoted, be rendered by the name of a chief Deity—e. g. *Jupiter*,—is it not plain that their only force would be to forbid men to worship more than one *Jupiter*, whilst they would be left free to worship as many other Deities as they please, under the name of *Neptune*, *Apollo*, *Mercury*, &c. &c.

In China, our first great warfare must from the necessity of the case, be against polytheism ; and a correct rendering of the above, and similar passages of the Scriptures, so that they shall bear a clear and unequivocal testimony on this point, is of the utmost importance. To us it seems clear that, to obtain this testimony against polytheism, we must use the name of the whole class worshiped as Gods by the Chinese, and not the name of any one Deity.

I said above that the Romanists have adopted a term for God which the Protestant missionaries are unwilling to use: this is, perhaps, the best place to state the reason, as it will throw light on the point we are now discussing, viz: the necessity there exists, from the very nature of the case, for using the generic term for God to render *Elohim*.

Much controversy, with respect to the proper word by which to render God, had existed among the Romish missionaries for many years before this point was decided by the Roman See. The use of *T'ien*, 天 Heaven, *Sháng Ti*, 上帝 Supreme Ruler, or Ruler on high, and *Shin*, 神 a God or Gods, according to some, and a Spirit, Spirits, or Genii according to others, was warmly advocated by different parties. Clement XI., in 1715, decreed that the phrase *T'ien Chú*, 天主 "Celestial Lord," or "Lord of Heaven," should be used, in future, as the term for God; and this phrase has been used ever since by the Romish missionaries. "Lord of Heaven" cannot be applied to false gods, or used as the generic term for God; the Romanists have therefore, rendered the First Commandment as follows: *kin sung yih T'ien Chú wan wuh chi sháng*, 欽崇一天主萬物之上, "Reverently worship or honor one Heavenly Lord above all things." Here it is plain that the design of this Commandment, to forbid the offer of religious worship to any other being than Jehovah, is neither expressed nor implied. According to this rendering of it, any number of saints and angels may be worshiped, provided Jehovah is placed above them and worshiped with more reverence.

Protestants, believing that the true God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—is the *only* proper object of religious worship, can never consent to such a rendering of this Commandment.

The Jesuits employed *T'ien* 天 Heaven, and *Sháng Ti*, 上帝 the Supreme Ruler, to render God, and thereby, no doubt, very much weakened their testimony against polytheism. To my mind, the reason which *Kánghu* assigned for refusing baptism is worthy of very serious consideration in connection with the question, whether we should use the name of the chief God of a ploytheistic nation, or the generic name for God in their language. We are told by John Bell of Antermomy, that when the missionaries besought him to become a Christian and be baptized, "he always excused himself by saying, he worshiped the same God with the Christians." What answer could they give? They used the name of his chief God, as the

term by which to render *Elohim*; and what conclusion could be more natural than the one he had drawn?

Lactantius cautions against the use of the name of the chief God of a polytheistic system for the very reason just assigned. It would seem the same use was made of it, as an excuse, in his day, that was made by the emperor *Kángki*.

"It is a vain persuasion of those who would give the name of Jupiter to the Supreme God. For some are wont thus to excuse their errors, when they have been convinced of one God, so as that they could not contradict it, by saying that themselves worshiped him, he being called by them Jupiter: than which, what can be more absurd? Since Jupiter is not worshiped without the partnership of his wife and daughter. From whence it plainly appears what this Jupiter is, and that the name ought not to be transferred thither where there is neither any Minerva nor Juno." *Lactantius Firmianus: quoted in Cudworth's Intellectual System. Edit. Harrison. Vol. 2. p. 149.*

4. The use of the name of any heathen Deity would be derogatory to the glory and honor of Jehovah.

There being in truth but one God, the existence of a generic term for God is owing entirely to polytheism. If none other than the true religion had ever prevailed, there could have been no such genus as this conceived of. The Gods of a polytheistic people are merely imaginary Beings, who have no real existence. The true God claims the right to displace the whole class; and this is the reason that, in translating the Scriptures into the language of such a people, the generic term for God must be used. Jehovah claims the right—not, to be recognized in the place of the chief God of such a system, but—to take the place of the whole class of gods. He will not consent to propose himself to polytheists as their Jupiter or Neptune, their *T'ien* 天 or their *Fuh* 佛 Budha.* He claims

* Origen thus warmly expresses himself on this subject: "Celsus thinks it to be a matter of no moment whether we call the highest and supreme God, *Adonai* and *Sabaoth*, as the Jews do; or *Dia* and *Zenu*, as the Greeks; or as the Egyptians, *Ammon*; or as the Scythians Pappæus; but we will rather endure any torment," says Origen, "than confess Zeus (or Jupiter) to be God; being well assured that the Greeks often really worship, under that name, an evil demon, who is an enemy both to God and man. And we will rather suffer death than call the supreme God Ammon, whom the Egyptian enchanters thus invoke: and though the Scythians call the supreme God Pappæus, yet we, acknowledging a supreme God, will never be persuaded to call him by that name, which it pleased that demon (who ruled once the Scythian desert. people and language,) to impose. Nevertheless, he that shall use the *appellative name for God*, either in the Scythian, Egyptian, or any other language, which he hath been brought up in will not offend." *Origen contra Celsum: quoted in Cudworth's Intellectual System. Vol. 1. 422.*

to be "the all and in all." He says, I am the God of heaven and the God of the earth; the God of the hills and the God of the valleys; the God of fire and the God of wealth; yea, of whatsoever place or thing, in the most unbounded license of your imagination, you have conceived a God to exist, *I am* the God thereof: "I am God and there is none else; there is no God beside me." We must, therefore, take for Jehovah the name of the whole class and affirm that it properly belongs to Him alone; that there is no other Being in the universe *entitled to this name*; that those whom the heathen have, in the days of their polytheistic ignorance, called gods, are mere imaginary Beings, who have no existence except in the minds of their blinded votaries.

The generic name for God, when thus claimed for Jehovah, undergoes a change by Christian usage: according to this usage it is employed in a proper sense, to designate Jehovah alone; and, but for the fact that it must still be used to combat polytheism, its generic character would wholly cease. But, as polytheism gave rise to so improper a *genus*, so the necessity there exists of forbidding men to have a plurality of Gods, causes the word to retain so much of its generic character as to make it available to prohibit sternly the recognition and worship of all the imaginary Beings who are by polytheists strictly and properly included in its meaning.

We might illustrate this point much more copiously, and enforce the use of the generic term by many other considerations; but knowing that "brevity is the soul of wit," we shall endeavor to be as brief, in the discussion of every point made, as we can, having due regard to a fair presentation of our subject. We shall pursue this course, not merely from a conviction of the truth of the above dictum, but also from the consideration that those for whom we write in England and America, and upon whom a most solemn responsibility devolves in connection with this question, have many important calls upon their time, which will make them desirous to have this matter submitted to them in the shortest compass in which it can be made intelligible.

The point above discussed, we regard as of the utmost importance, and the reason we do not pursue the subject is that we are persuaded our readers will agree with us in the conclusion to which we have come, that the generic term *must* be used. And here I would beg my missionary Brethren, in China, to pause; and laying aside all the partiality to any particular term that may have been contracted by previous use, to settle definitely in their minds this previous

general question, before they proceed with us to the examination of the particular question—What Chinese word shall be used to render θεος?

If we have succeeded thus far in carrying along with us the convictions of our readers, then the point remaining for our consideration is narrowed down to the single question, What is the generic name for God in the Chinese language?

To this question we answer, with Morrison and Milne and Marshman, in the Chinese language, *Shin* 神 is the generic name for God.

To this question a different answer has, however, been given. Within the last few months another term, which, so far as we have been able to ascertain, was never previously regarded in this light by any foreigner, Romanist or Protestant, has been proposed as the generic name for God. This term is *Ti* 帝.

The point to be decided then is, Which of these two terms is the generic name of God in the Chinese language.

We shall first endeavor to prove that *Shin* is the generic term sought, and then state the reasons that forbid us to regard *Ti* as the name of any class of Beings either human or divine.

To give prominence to the point upon which we rely, as sustaining our view of *Shin* 神, and to enable the reader, at a glance, to comprehend the bearing of the evidence adduced, for his conviction, we present a brief Synopsis of our argument.

We beg that the important point, already proved, may be kept in mind when reading this Synopsis, viz. that the generic name for God must be used to render *Elohim* and θεος.

To prevent all misunderstanding, that might arise from a vague use of terms, we shall preface this Synopsis with a definition of the phrase, "generic name for God," which occurs so frequently in this discussion.

By the generic name for God, in Chinese, we understand the name of the *highest genus or class of Beings* to whom the Chinese offer *religious worship*. On this definition we shall offer no remark, except that it is the plainest and simplest we can frame, and that we presume it will be assented to immediately by every one upon reading it.

SYNOPSIS.

1. *Shin* is the name of a *class of invisible Beings* to whom the Chinese, from the highest antiquity to the present time, have always offered *religious worship*.

2. The class of Beings called *Shin* is the highest class worshiped by the Chinese.

Proofs. 1st. The *Shin* are directly affirmed to be the most honorable Beings in the universe.

2d. The chief God, the Being worshiped in the highest sacrifice, offered in the state religion, is a *Shin*.

3d. It is maintained that, being the highest class of Beings worshiped by the Chinese, as above stated, this class must be regarded as the Gods of China, and *Shin* as the generic name for God.

We shall consider these points in the order in which they are presented above, and then state and answer the chief objections that have been made to the use of *Shin*.

The first point. *Shin is the name of a class of invisible Beings to whom the Chinese, from the highest antiquity to the present time, have always offered religious worship.*

The two facts above stated, viz. that *Shin* is the name of a class of Beings, and that to these Beings the Chinese have always offered religious worship, are freely admitted by those who oppose the use of this word to render θεός into Chinese. We might content ourselves with this admission and pass on to our second head, but that this is the most convenient place to make the Reader acquainted with many facts, in connection with our subject, important to a correct decision of the point at issue.

It is perhaps well known to the learned in Europe and America that the words of the Chinese language undergo no inflection, either of declension or conjugation, and that the same word may, in different contexts, be a noun, adjective, verb or adverb. To mark these different uses, of the same uninflected word, they rely entirely upon the position the word occupies in the sentence and the subject treated of in the context; leaving the reader to infer, from these, what part of speech it may be and which of its several meanings it may have in any given sentence.

The word *Shin* is used as a noun, adjective and verb. It occurs much the most frequently as a noun; as an adjective it is also frequently used; but it is rarely used as a verb. As a noun it may be either concrete or abstract; but it is concrete in a very large majority of instances. When used in a concrete sense, it is the name of a class of invisible Beings, worshiped by the Chinese, as we have said above. In this case we contend that it is to be translated a *god* or *gods*, as it may be singular or plural in any given instance. When used in an abstract sense, to express a quality belonging to any Being,

it means Divinity, or divine energy. It is also used in this sense by the Chinese Pantheists, as the name of that which pervades their *το παν*. When used as an adjective, its meaning is derived directly from its abstract sense, divinity; it means divine. As a verb, it very rarely occurs. It means to regard and treat as a God, &c.

It will be found, when we come to treat of the objections urged against this word, that they are almost all drawn from its uses in the abstract sense. This is a difficulty which arises from the peculiarity of the Chinese language; it meets us not only as an objection to the use of *Shin* but almost every other word we shall use in translating the Scriptures will be found encumbered with the same difficulty, viz; that it occurs sometimes with meanings very different from the one we design to convey. In writing in such a language as the Chinese it is enough for our purpose if the word has clearly, by the well known usage of good Chinese writers, the meaning we design to convey, and we so use it that the context shall make it plain that this the sense in which it is used. The inherent difficulties in the way of a decision of this question, to which we referred in a previous part of this paper, we suppose to arise chiefly from this source. But this difficulty should not appal us. If *Shin* in the concrete sense means a *god* or *gods*, and we can in every case when using it for the true or a false god, make it plain to the Reader that it is in the concrete sense that we are using the word, then all difficulties arising from this source are removed. That this can be done we entertain not the slightest doubt.

If what we have said above is correct, then it follows, that an objection to the use of *Shin*, to be a valid one, must be drawn from the meaning it has when used as a concrete noun: it must go to prove that the class of Beings called *Shin* are not to be regarded as gods in the sense of heathen nations: and therefore that it is not the generic name for God in Chinese.

The present opposers of the use of *Shin*, it is understood, whilst they freely admit that *Shin* is the name of a class of Beings whom the Chinese have always worshiped, deny that they are the highest class worshiped; and affirm that there is a class of Beings called *Ti*, higher than the class called *Shin*, who are to be regarded as the gods of the Chinese; while the *Shin*, being only a secondary class, are (to borrow an illustration from Greek mythology) to be regarded as *Δαιμονες*.

This is the true *issue* upon which this case should be tried. Upon this issue we beg: the reader to fix his eye, and to weigh all the

evidence submitted to him by its bearing upon this point. All else is beside the mark, if we are determined to use the generic name for God, which the Chinese language affords us, to render *Elohim* and *θεος*.

We shall now briefly cite authorities to show that the *Shin* were revered and worshiped by the sages and ancient worthies of China, reserving the question, whether they are to be regarded as gods, to our second and third divisions.

We have so good a summary of the views entertained of the *Shin*, during the first three dynasties, from the pen of P. Amiot in M. De Guignes' translation of the *Shú King*, that I shall not trouble the Reader with much additional evidence on this point. M. De Guignes thus states the circumstances that caused P. Amiot to prepare the paper cited below.

“ Dans le dessein de connoître plus particulièrement la Religion des Chinois, non celle des Philosophes, mais celle du peuple, j'avois demandé au P. Amiot, missionnaire a Pe King, si ces Peuples avoient des *Divinités nationales* auxquelles ils adressassent des prières. J'euteus par *Divinités nationales* celle qui sont propres à la nation, et qui n'ont pas été introduites à la chine par les Bonzes de Lao-tse, ni par ceux de Fo. J'en avais meme demandé les représentations, il m'a repondu sur ce sujet; je crois qu' on ne sera pas fâché de trouver ici cette réponse, concernant des Esprits dont nous n'avons aucune connoissance dans les mémoires qu' on a publié sur la chine. Le Père Amiot a tiré ce qu' il dit d'un ouvrage intitulé Chin-y-tien, qui est une collection en plus de cent volumes, dans lesquels sont renfermés les plus anciens monumens : les dix premiers contiennent les Esprits.”

We commence our extracts from this answer with the times of the *Shú King*, the oldest we think sustained by authentic evidence.

P. Amiot writes, “ Yao ordonna à Chun de sacrifier au Chang-ti (*Shang-ti*) et a tous les Esprits (*Shin* 神); ce qui est confirmé par le chapitre Chuntien du Chou King. On voit encore dans le Chou King que Chun ordonna a Pe-y de déterminer des rits particuliers pour honorer les Esprits du Ciel, ceux de la Terre et les Manes des hommes, et a Tchong-li de presider aux affaires qui avoient rapport aux sacrifices qu' on offroit au ciel, à la Terre, et aux Esprits de tous les ordres. Yu, Fondateur de la Dynastie de Hia, étoit plein de respect pour les Kouei (manes of ancestors) et pour les chin (*Shin*) suivant le temoignage de tous les Historiens. Ses successeurs imiterent son exemple pour ce qui regarde en particulier le culte des Esprits.

“ Tching-tang, suivant le Chou-King, étoit plein de vénération pour les Esprits supérieurs et inférieurs. Vou-ye, un de ses successeurs, fit faire avec du bois une statue de figure humaine, à laquelle il donna le nom d' Esprit. Ce Princee impie et cruel prenoit plaisir à faire jouer avec ce prétendu Esprit ceux qui avoient eu le malheur d'encourir sa disgrâce, et les faisoit mettre à

mort impitoyablement s'ils venoient à perdre la partie, ce qui arrivait presque toujours. La statue, dit le commentaire, représentait un Esprit du ciel; le jeu auquel on la faisoit jouer était une espece de jeu de dames; apparemment que quelque ministre des barbares voulut de ce Prince jouait au nom du prétendu esprit. Quoi qu'il en soit voila le premier exemple qu'on trouve dans l'Histoire Chinoise d'une représentation d'Esprit: car le Chin-ting ou le Trépied, à ce que je crois, étoit plutôt un symbole qu'une représentation.

“Cheou, le dernier de la Dynastie de Chang, est appelé impie, parce qu'il n'avoit pas pour le ciel ni pour les Esprits ce respect ni cette vénération dont les anciens Empereurs lui avoient laissé l'exemple. Et c'est en particulier pour le punir de son impiété ajoutent les Historiens que le ciel ôta l'Empire à sa race pour le donner à la famille du Prince Ven Vang.

“Sous les Tcheou, ou sous la troisième Dynastie, le cérémonial chinois prit une forme nouvelle par les additions considérables qu'on y fit. Il n'y a qu'à lire la quatrième Partie du Chou-king, le Chi king et le Tcheou-li, pour se convaincre que le culte des Esprits étoit un des articles les plus essentiels sous cette dynastie. Il est dit dans le Tcheou-le (Ritual of the Chow Dynasty) que l'officier qui présidoit aux affaires de la terre employoit le *Ley Kou* (*Lou Kou*) dans les sacrifices qu'on offroit aux esprits, (*the god of heaven*) le *Ling-kou* dans les sacrifices qu'on offroit aux Che (*gods of the earth*) et le *Lou-kou* dans les sacrifices qu'on offroit aux Kouei (*the manes of men*.)

“Le Commentaire dit que le *Lou Kou* étoit un tambour à huit faces, les Esprits dans les sacrifices desquels on l'employoit étoient ceux du ciel. Le *Ling-Kou* avoit six faces. Les Che sont en général les Esprits de la Terre; on les prend quelquefois pour les Esprits particuliers qui président aux générations. Les Kouei étoient les manes des hommes, et on se servoit, dans les sacrifices qu'on leur faisoit, du tambour appelé *Lou Kou*, qui avoit quatre faces: ce tambour étoit employé pour les ancêtres en particulier.

“Outre les sacrifices qu'on offroit à certains Esprits en particulier, il y en avoit d'autres qu'on offroit à tous les Esprits en général; et dans ces sortes de sacrifices on admettoit les deux dauses *Ping-Vou* et *Hou-vou*, c'est-à-dire, la *Dause guerrière* et la *Dause du Drapeau*.

“Ven-vang et Vou-vang faisoient consister dans le culte qu'ils rendoient aux Esprits un des points les plus essentiels de leur Religion. Le ciel, les ancêtres et les Esprits, voilà les trois objets de leur vénération.”

It will not escape the attention of the Reader that this good Father makes no mention of any class of Beings called *Ti*, 帝, who were regarded as “les Divinités nationales des Chinois.” He surely could have had no idea that *Ti* was the generic term for God in Chinese.

We shall next quote a few passages from the *Shû King*. The passages cited below are all from Dr Medhurst's translation of the *Shû King*. We take the translation from this work for the purpose of showing to what class of Beings Dr. Medhurst regarded the *Shin* as

belonging when he published his translation, which was A. D. 1846.

“The Emperor (Shun) said, Oh, you (President of the four) mountains, is there any one who can regulate for me the true ceremonies.”

These ceremonies are thus explained in a note translated from the commentary. “The three ceremonies are the ceremonies used in sacrificing to the celestial gods (*Shin*), feasting the Spirits of enm, and offering to the terrestrial deities (*K'i*). *Medhurst Shú King*, p. 33.

The critical commentary tells us that “the object of these rites was to serve the gods (*Shin*) as Lords, *li í sz' Shin wei Chú*,”
禮以事神爲主。

“Make use of the panpipe to regulate the voice, and eight kinds of instruments, when you can harmonize the whole, but do not interfere with the due order. Then both gods (*Shin*) and men will approve.” *Med: Shú King* p. 35.

“E-ymn (who lived during the Sháng dynasty (B. C. 1710) then composed a written declaration saying, The former King (T'hang) attentively regarded Heaven's bright decree in order to obtain the favor of the upper and nether powers, the celestial and terrestrial gods (*Shin* 神, and *K'i* 祇), the deities who preside over the laud and grain, with the spirits of the ancestral temple; in all this he was invariably respectful; Heaven noticed his virtues and made use of him to sustain the great decree, and soothe and tranquilize the myriad states.” *Medhurst's Shú King*, p. 145.

The King Ching wáng of the Chau dynasty (B. C. 1064) thus addresses the eldest son of the King of Yin: “You have trod in and followed his (T'hang's) footsteps and long possessed a good reputation, being respectful, cautious, and filial, as well as reverential and respectful to both gods (*Shin* 神) and men. I admire your virtue and say that it is abundant, whilst you are not unmindful of your predecessor. (*Sháng Ti* 上帝) the supreme Ruler has frequently enjoyed (your sacrifices) while the lower people (have thereby become) reverential and harmonious. I therefore appointed you to be an arch-Duke to rule over this eastern territory of Hea. *Medhurst, Shú king*, p. 223.

The Reader will observe that the gods (*Shin*) are contrasted above with men and the word *Shin* is evidently used as a general name for all the Beings worshiped by the Chinese at that time. His attention is also called to the fact that *Sháng Ti*, the supreme Ruler, (the

title by which the chief god of the classics is designated) having enjoyed his sacrifices is cited as an instance of his respect to the gods (*Shin*) mentioned in the preceding sentence.

To avoid tediousness we shall cite only one more passage from this work. In the 5th Book, section first, the officers of the Chau dynasty are enumerated and their duties described. Those of the *Tsung Peh* 宗伯 are thus mentioned.

“The chief Baron (*tsung peh* 宗伯) superintends the public ceremonies, regulates (the respect to be paid to both gods (*Shin* 神) and men, and arranges (the ranks of superiors and inferiors.” *Medhurst; Shú King*, p. 289.

We now pass on to the consideration of our second point, viz; *The class of beings called Shin is the highest class worshiped by the Chinese.*

Of this point we promised two kinds of proof. First, the direct affirmations of Chinese writers to this effect; and secondly, to show that the chief God, the Being worshiped in the highest sacrifice offered in the state religion, is a *Shin*. If this last point is clearly made out, the proposition must be considered as proved beyond all question: The Chinese can have no higher Being than their chief God.

The first witness we shall produce is the *Chau Lí* 禮周 the Ritual of the *Chau* dynasty. This is the work of *Chau kung*, the son of *Wan wáng* the founder of the *Chau* dynasty. *Chau kung* flourished B. C. 1100. and ranks next to Confucius, in the estimation of the Chinese. This work, it is believed, is the oldest Ritual extant in the language.

It is from such a book, if any where, that we may expect to learn who were the objects to whom the Chinese addressed their religious worship. To this work, for these reasons, we earnestly desire to direct the attention of our Missionary Brethren, in China, who may be investigating this subject.

We learn from the *Chau Lí* that there was an officer called *tsung peh* 宗伯, whose duties are thus described. The office of the great *tsung peh* was to establish and regulate the ceremonies (used in worshiping) the *national* gods, celestial and terrestrial (*Shin* 神 and *K'i* 祇) and the human manes, *in order to aid the king to build up and protect his country.*” See *Chau Lí Sect. 18. p. 1.*

Throughout this work we find, as P. Amiot has told us above, the objects of religious worship in the *national rites* enumerated under these three names viz; *Shin* celestial gods, *K'i* terrestrial gods, and *Kwei* human manes.

We have no mention made of any officer appointed to superintend national rites offered to any class of Beings called *tí* 帝, nor is there any mention of any such class among the classes of Beings to whom the rites regulated by the *tsung pch* were offered. *Shángtí*, the Ruler on high, is mentioned; but he comes in under the enumeration above mentioned, and as a *tien Shin* 天神, God of Heaven.

At Sect. 18. p. 2. We read *i kih lí sz páng kwoh kwei Shin K'í*, 以吉禮事邦國鬼神示. He (the *tsung pch*) made use of the felicitous rites to serve the *Kwei*, *Shin*, *K'í* i. e. the manes and the celestial and terrestrial gods of the country." The human manes being in this sentence placed first, causes the commentator to notice and explain the reason of three different orders in which the words, *Shin*, *K'í*, *Kwei* are written. First, when written *Shin*, *Kwei*, *K'í*, celestial gods, human manes, and terrestrial gods, this is to mark the distinction of above (celestial) and below (terrestrial). Second, when written *Kwei*, *Shin*, *K'í*, this is to mark nearness of relationship, and the manes of ancestors are placed first. Third, when written, *Shin*, *K'í*, *Kwei*, this is to mark the degrees of honour in which they are respectively held; the *Shin*, being most honorable, are named first, the *K'í* next, and the *Kwei* last as the least honorable.

Thus we see that there are only three classes of Beings mentioned as the objects of national worship in this Ritual, and that the *Shin* are the most honorable of these three.

Sect. 17. p 1. Text. "The Emperor appointed an officer of the spring, called *tsung pch*, to command those under him and to superintend the national ceremonies in order to aid the King to harmonize the state.

In the commentary called *Ching í* 正義 the purpose for which the national rites were instituted is stated, as follows. "The Emperor appointed the *tsung pch* to superintend the national rites; these rites were to serve the (*Shin*) gods as the highest (*lí í sz' shin wei sháng*.) 禮以事神爲上); they were also the means whereby they caused the people of the empire to recompense their root and to revert to their origin."

In the commentary marked *Ngán*, 案. we read, "Shun (B. C. 2169) ordered *Pch-í* to superintend the three ceremonies: his title was called *Chih tsung*. The men of the *Chau* dynasty because of this, established the officer of the Spring called *tsung pch*; for celestial gods, terrestrial gods and human manes are the most honorable (Beings) in the universe."

Here is the direct testimony we promised. We have seen that of the three classes of Beings, worshiped in the national rites, the *Shin* are the most honorable; and now we are directly told that these classes are the most honorable in the universe.

We shall next cite a passage from the *Lí-ki*, another Ritual, prepared by the scholars of the Hán dynasty, which is also in high estimation among the Chinese :

Lí ki, tí chú 禮註, Ed. Sect. 5. p. 23. In commenting on the phrase of the text, *tsí tí fuh yung ye* 祭帝弗用也, "In sacrificing to the Ruler they did not use pregnant animals," the critical commentator says, "In sacrificing to the Ruler pregnant animals were not used. The reason that, in the border sacrifice, they used the three year old bullock was in order to give importance to the idea of sincerity, and by the sincerity of the victim manifest the sincerity of their hearts. This is the gist of the idea. The celestial god, (*t'ien shin*) 天神 is most honorable with whom nothing can be compared; therefore, they used the three year old bullock."

We have translated the phrase, *tien shin* 天神 of the commentator celestial god, in the singular, as there can be little doubt the reference is to the *tí*, 帝, ruler, of the text, a title by which the chief god of the Chinese is frequently designated.

The Reader may recollect that, when the *tsung peh* was mentioned in the quotation from the *Shú King*, at page 30, we were told his office was "to superintend the public ceremonies and to regulate the respect to be paid to both gods (*Shin*) and men."

Here it will be observed, the word *Shin* is used alone instead of the three words, *Shin, K'i, Kwei*, which we met with in the *Chau Lí*, when his office was described. When remarking on another question from the *Shí King*, we said that the word *Shin* in the phrase, "gods and men," was evidently used to include all the objects of their national worship. The accounts, given above, of the *tsung peh's* office, from the *Chau Lí*, fully sustain our remark. We however deem this of so much importance that we shall quote Chinese authority, directly to the point, to sustain this *usus loquendi* of the word *Shin*.

Chau Lí, Sect. 19. p. 1. Text. "The office of the Lesser *tsung peh* was to superintend and set up the shrines of the national gods." The word *Shin* alone being here mentioned in the text, as in the case of the quotations from the *Shú king*, and the objects of worship in the national rites being generally elsewhere in the *Chau Lí* mentioned

under the three names of *Shin*, *K'i*, *Kwei*, gives occasion to the commentator to make the following remark: "If we speak of them (i. e. the objects worshiped in the national rites) separately, the *t'ien Shin*, celestial gods, are alone called *Shin*; but if we speak of them collectively, then the *Kwei*, human manes and *K'i*, terrestrial gods, are both called *Shin*."

Thus we see that *Shin*, while it specially designates the highest class of Beings worshiped in the national rites of the *Chau* dynasty, is also used as a general term, including all the objects worshiped by that dynasty.

What more comprehensive term could we desire to use, in waging our warfare against polytheism? How admirably does this word answer all our wants in translating the First Commandment! What higher evidence, than that given above, can be demanded to prove that *Shin* is the generic name for God in Chinese?

Can it be affirmed that any other word, in the language, thus includes all the objects worshiped in the national rites of the Chinese?

The next point to be proved is, that, *the chief god of the Chinese, the Being worshiped in the highest sacrifice offered in the state religion, is a Shin.*

The proof of this point is very important to sustain our position, that *Shin* is the generic name for God in Chinese, and that this word should be used to render *Elohim* and *θεός*. We have seen that the *Shin* are the highest class of Beings worshiped in the national rites of the Chinese; but if it could be proved that the Chinese themselves had conceived of a Being higher than any of this class, a Being whom they never included in the same genus with the other objects worshiped, this would prove the existence of a kind of Monotheistic feature in their system: and this fact would be a strong argument against the use of the generic name, *Shin*, to designate Jehovah. If however, we clearly prove that the chief god worshiped by the Chinese is distinctly numbered among this class of Beings, then we conceive the highest proof of our position, which can be demanded, will have been furnished.

We have shown above that the *Shin* are said to be "the most honorable Beings in the universe," and that the "celestial *Shin* is most honorable, with whom nothing can be compared;" and might from this infer, without danger of mistake, that the highest Being known to the Chinese would be included among the class of Beings called *Shin*. To this inference no objection could be offered; but we are not left to mere inference: the classical books furnish us with clear

and direct testimony on this point, and that in more abundance than we can venture to tax the Reader's patience with.

Before however proceeding to cite this testimony, we must make the reader acquainted with the names of the highest objects worshipped in the national rites of the Chinese; and call his attention to a great diversity of opinion which exists among the Chinese of the present day, with respect to what is designated by these names; a diversity of opinion to which much of the difficulty with which this subject is invested is no doubt to be ascribed.

From the earliest antiquity to the present times, the two highest objects of veneration, in the national rites of China, have been called *t'ien* 天 heaven and *ti* 地, earth; and to the worship of these two objects, a sacrifice called *kiâu*, 郊 offered at the winter and summer solstices, has, from time immemorial, been appropriated.

The question that occurs to every one, upon learning this fact, is, Do the Chinese understand, by these words, the visible Heavens and Earth upon which they tread, or are the words used by metonymy for the invisible Beings, who preside over Heaven and Earth respectively? To this we answer; It is conceded on all hands, we believe, that the material objects are not the objects of worship; and that the words, when used as the names of objects of worship, are employed metaphorically. What then is the object definitely designated by the word *t'ien* 天 heaven, the highest of the objects worshipped in the national rites?

To this question two different answers may be given, according as regard is had to one or the other of two opinions held, by Chinese of different sects, on this point. During the Sung dynasty, (about A. D. 1100,) there sprung up a sect of Philosophers to whom the Romanish Missionaries have given the name of Atheo-politique, and to whose views great prominence has been given in all the editions of the classical works published during the present dynasty. This sect would answer the question, what is meant by *t'ien* 天, as follows: *t'ien* 天 is *Shàng tí* 上帝, the Ruler on high; and *Shàng tí* is *tí*, 理 the rule of order, destiny, fate.

There is another class, however, who we conceive represent the polytheists of China, and the old views of the state religion, as presented in the *Chau Li* (Ritual of the Chau dynasty: B. C. 1100,) who answer as follows: The *t'ien*, 天, worshiped at the winter solstice is, *t'ien chí shin*, 天之神 the god of Heaven, and this *t'ien chí Shin*, 天之神 god of Heaven, is *Shàng tí*, 上帝 the Ruler on high.

It will be observed that, according to both of the opinions, above expressed, the word *heaven* is used metaphorically, and that to *t'ien* 天 the title of *Sháng ti* 上帝 the Ruler on high is given by both parties; but the one party so explain their views as to lead to a mere lifeless principle *lí*, which they say, "neither wills nor wishes, acts nor does;" while the other party lead us to polytheism, and to regard the *t'ien chi shin* 天之神, the Shin of heaven, and the *ti chí K'í* 地之示, the *K'í* (or Shin, as he is also called,) of earth, as the two greatest gods in their pantheon.

We shall present a few quotations, from the works of several of the most distinguished Foreigners who have written on the Chinese religion, that the Reader may have a clearer view of what has been summarily stated above.

"The chief object of their worship is the Supreme Being, Lord and chief Sovereign of all things, which they worshiped under the names of Chang Ti (*Sháng ti*), that is *Supreme Emperor*, or Tien (or *t'ien* 天), which, according to the Chinese, signifies the same thing; Tien, say the Interpreters, is the Spirit (*Shin!*) that presides in heaven, because *Heaven is the most excellent work produced by the first cause*; it is taken also for the material Heavens, but this depends upon the subject to which it is applied." *Du Halde's History of China*. Vol. 3. p. 16.

This is the view Du Halde gives of the second class we have spoken of above: of the sect of the Learned he writes as follows.

"About the year 1070 was the time when these interpreters (the modern Doctors) appeared, who gained a great reputation; the most famous was Tchu tse (*Chu tsz'* 朱子) and Tching tse (*Ching tsz'* 程子) who published their works under the reign of the sixth prince of the family of Sung. Tchu tse distinguished himself so greatly, by his capacity, that they revered him as the prince of Learning. Though these authors have been had in esteem for these five or six hundred years past, yet they are still looked upon as modern authors, especially when compared with the ancient interpreters, who lived fifteen ages before them. These new Doctors pretended that their doctrine was founded on the most ancient of the Chinese books, but their explanations were very obscure and full of equivocal expressions that made it seem as though they were afraid of rejecting the old doctrine, and yet in reality what they advanced was entirely new."

"They give the first principle of all things the name of *Tái kih* (太極) which they say is impossible to be explained, being sepa-

rated from imperfections of matter, and therefore can have no appellation agreeable to its nature: however, they compare it to the ridge of a house which serves to unite the roof; to the root of a tree; to the axletree of a chariot; to a hinge, on which all things turn; and they affirm it to be the basis and pillar and the foundation of all things. It is not, say they, a chimerical Being, like to the vacuum of the Bonzes; but it is a real Being, which had existence before all things, and yet is not distinguished from them, being the same thing with the perfect and the imperfect, the Heaven, the Earth, and the five elements, insomuch that every thing may, in a sense, be called *T'ai kih*."

"To this same being, which they called *T'ai kih*, they likewise give the name of 理 *Li*; and this, they say farther, joined to matter, is the composition of all natural bodies and specificates and distinguishes one thing from another. Their reasonings, in points of morality, are the same: they call *Li* that which establishes the reciprocal duty between the Prince and the subject, the father and the son, the husband and the wife; they likewise give the name of *Li* to the soul, because it informs the body, and when it ceases to inform it, the *Li* is said to be destroyed; in short, when they have disputed in this unintelligible manner concerning the nature of *T'ai kih* and *Li*, they necessarily fall into atheism, because they exclude every efficient supernatural cause, and admit no other principle than an inanimate virtue or energy united to the matter, to which they give the name *Li* or *T'ai-kih*.

"But they find themselves much embarrassed when they would vainly elude the great number of plain texts, in the ancient books, which speak of Spirits (*Shin*), of justice, of Providence, of a Supreme Being, and the knowledge which he has of the secrets of men's hearts, &c.; for when they endeavour to explain them, in their own gross manner, they are certain to fall into fresh contradiction, destroying in one place what they establish in another.

"However, if we may credit the testimony of a great number of Missionaries, who have spent the chief part of their lives in the Empire, and who have gained an exact knowledge of the Chinese affairs by means of studying their books, and conversing with men of the greatest repute for knowledge among them, the truly learned have not given way to these mad notions, but have adhered strictly to the texts of the ancient Books, without regarding the extravagant notions of these modern commentators.

"But, that I may act the part of a faithful historian, I cannot deny that some of the Missionaries have been persuaded that all the learned in the Empire are no better than so many atheists, and that whatever declarations the Emperor Cang hi (*K'ang hî*) and others have made to the contrary, have been the effect of mere compliance or downright dissimulation; for though the above mentioned prince averred that, it was not to the visible or material heavens that he offered sacrifice, but to the Lord and Creator of Heaven and Earth and all things, he might mean the root and origin of all things, which is nothing else but the *Li*, or celestial virtue, inherent in matter, which is, according to the Chinese atheists, the principle of all things."

"Besides, when we read in their books and hear the Chinese affirm that Life and Death, Poverty and Riches, and all events in general depend on *tien* (天) or Heaven; that nothing is done but by his order, that he rewards the Good and punishes the Wicked, that he cannot be deceived, that he sees all things, hears all things, and knows all things, that he penetrates the secret recesses of the heart, that he hears the complaints of the good and virtuous, and grants their petitions, &c.; all these expressions, according to *them* ought to be looked upon as metaphorical, by which they would have the people understand that all things happen as if in reality Heaven was an intelligent Being.

P. Prémare, in *De Guines' S'ui King*, p. 49. thus expresses his views of the senses in which *tien* 天 is understood,

"Il y a donc un ciel qui a fait, et un ciel qui a été fait; et puisque le Grand homme a fait le ciel et toutes choses, il faut que le Grand homme soit le ciel qui n'a point été fait, mais qui est la source et la cause de tous les êtres: comme dit le Li Kí, le ciel corporel et visible est le symbole du ciel invisible, comme le Tai-Ki matériel est une image grossière du Tai-Ki spirituel, qui est la même chose que Tai-y ou l'unité."

"Hiu Chin, expliquant le caractère *yih* —, dit ces paroles: *Au premier commencement la raison subsistait dans l'unité; c'est elle qui fit et divisa le ciel et la Terre, convertit et perfectionna toutes choses.* Cela est clair et formel; et puisque c'est la, raison qui a fait le ciel et la terre, et qu'il est cependant vrai que le ciel a fait toutes choses il faut nécessairement conclure que le caractère *Tien* a deux sens, et qu'il dénote quelquefois l'ouvrage et le plus souvent l'ouvrier; c'est la grande unité que le Choue-ven (*Shwō wän*) appelle *T'ao*; c'est à cet Esprit (*Shin?*) auquel les anciens Empereurs offroient des sacrifices, qui n'étoient dûs qu'au Dieu Souverain."

M. Visdelou, in his letter to the cardinals of the Propaganda, gives the following account of the views of the Chinese in respect to the first principle.

“Quant à ce qui regarde le premier principe, voici ce qui dit ce livre (Yih King), Tai Ki a engendré deux effigies ; ces deux effigies ont engendré quatre images, ces quatre images ont engendré les huit trigrammes de *Fo-hi*.” “Il faut ici observer soigneusement qu’il dit *engendrer*, et non faire.”

“Ses chinois interprètent allégoriquement les deux effigies *Yong* et *Yu* par les deux matières, ou la matière universelle divisée en deux ; mais dans le sens propre, elles signifient le ciel et la Terre.”

“Mais les philosophes exposent plus clairement cet axiome ; car voici ce qu’ils disent sans aucune allégorie. Le *grand comble*, Tai Ki, a engendré le ciel et la Terre ; le ciel et la Terre ont engendré les cinq éléments ; les cinq éléments ont engendré toutes choses. Ce même axiome est l’abîme dans lequel se sont précipités les philosophes que l’on appelle *athéo-politiques*, car ils prétendent que ce *grand comble* est la raison primitive, qui, quoique sans entendement, ni voluté, est absolument le premier principe de toutes choses. Ils veulent que quoique cette raison soit privée d’entendement et de voluté elle gouverne pourtant toutes choses, et cela d’autant plus infailliblement qu’elle agit nécessairement. Ils prétendent enfin, que tout émane d’elle, ce que ce mot *engendrer* semble indiquer. Aussi ces Philosophes n’hésitent—ils pas de donner à cette raison le titre de *dame gouvernante* ; et, comme *Confucius* dans le livre canonique des changemens (Yih King) a fait plus d’une fois mention du *Chingti* (*Sháng Ti*) c’est-à-dire du *Suprême Empereur* ; et du *Ti* (天 *Ti*), c’est-à-dire de l’*Empereur*, et que cependant on ne voit nulle part dans ce livre, ni dans les autres, que le *Chang ti* ait engendré la matière, c’est-à-dire, le ciel et la Terre ; les Philosophes conclurent delà que le titre de *Chang ti* ne peut convenir à la raison primitive, que quand il s’agit seulement du gouvernement de l’univers. Delà vient que plusieurs d’entreux admettent, outre la raison primitive, un génie (*Shin*?) celeste approprié au ciel &c. &c.”

Again : “Je ne dois pas omettre ici que le terme de ciel s’entend de trois façons ; il signifie le grand comble, quelquefois aussi le ciel matériel ; souvent, parmi ceux qui admettent des Génies (*Shin*) dans tous les grands corps du monde, il est employé pour désigner ce génie ; ou plutôt selon l’habile Interprète qui a fait la concordance des quatre livres classiques, le ciel est pris tantôt pour la raison primitive, tantôt pour la matière seule, et tantôt pour la raison primitive et la matière ensemble.

In the above quotation the Reader has a pretty full *exposé* of the various views held on this subject by the sects of the Confucian School in China. Of the views of the class called *athéo-politique*, M. Visdelou thus farther writes :

“Les philosophes chinois parlent de révéler le ciel ; mais ils entendent par le ciel ; la Raison, non pas celle qui fait l’homme et qui n’est point l’effet

de celle là mais la Raison primitive, qui est la premier principe et la cause nécessaire de toutes choses. Respecter cette Raison, c'est la suivre; de même que l'on respecte le Destin non par les prières et le honneurs mais en se soumettant à ses loix. Les destinées, disent ils, sont marquées par le ciel, c'est-à-dire, par la Raison primitive, qui est le premier principe de tous les êtres, à la vérité elle agit à l'aveugle, mais, la même nécessité qui la rend aveugle la rend aussi infaillible. C'est elle qui est le Destin en tant qu'elle agit nécessairement, cette doctrine est celle que les missionnaires appellent *athéo-politique*."

Again: "Les athées rigides se raillent communément de tout le gendre des Dieux. Comme ils croient que tout est réglé par le destin, ils ne laissent aucun lieu aux prières et aux vœux et ne parlent qu'avec mépris de religions où l'on sacrifie."

Dr. Medhurst, in his work entitled "China; its state and Prospects", thus expresses his views of the Confucian system:

"It is strange, however, that while Confucius recommends such an excessive veneration for parents, he should have overlooked the reverence due to the Father of our Spirits: and while he traced up the series, from parents to ancestors, requiring the highest degree of honor to be paid to our first progenitors, that he should not have considered Him from whom all Beings spring, and who is entitled to our first and chief regard. But it is a lamentable proof of the depravity of the human heart, that so acute, intelligent, vigorous and independent a mind should not have traced the generations of men up to the great Former of all, and left his followers in the dark as to the *being, attributes, and perfections* of the one living and true God."

"There are, in the works of the Philosopher, some allusions to Heaven as the presiding power of nature, and to fate as the determiner of all things, but he does not appear to attribute *originality to the one, or rationality to the other*; and thus his system remains destitute of the main truth which lies at the basis of all truth, viz: the being of a self-existent, eternal, all-wise God"

Again: "From these expressions, about "Heaven," the "Supreme Ruler," and the "principle of order", we might infer that the Chinese *had some knowledge of the Ruler of the universe*, and honored him as such, were we not baffled by the very incoherent manner in which they express themselves, and shocked at the propensity to materialism which they constantly exhibit."

Of Confucius, Dr. Medhurst thus writes. "This expression, 'equal to heaven,' is often repeated by the Chinese, with reference to Confucius; and *there can be no doubt* that they mean, thereby, to place their favorite sage on a level with the powers of nature, and

in fact to deify him. Thus, have these atheistical people deified the man, that taught them that matter was eternal and that all *existences* originated in a *mere principle*."

"In drawing up the foregoing view of Confucius and his system, although he does not say so, we presume that Dr. Medhurst followed the views of those whom Du Halde calls the modern doctors, and M. Visdelou the sect of the Atheo-politique. In his chapter on the religions of China, in his work above quoted, Dr. Medhurst makes no mention of any other class, among the learned, than atheists, and thus sums up the faith of the Confucianists, Táuists, and Budhists. "No first cause characterises all the sects, and the supreme, self-existent God is scarcely traceable through the entire range of their metaphysics; and yet the Chinese manage to combine the apparently irreconcilable principles of atheism and polytheism." Gods many and lords many," are adopted by every sect, and *it is more easy to find a god than a man in China*. Though they account *no divinity to be eternal*, yet they discover a god in every thing."

All, who have ever been in China, will confirm the above testimony, as to the multiplicity of the gods worshiped by the Chinese people; and they will, we presume, all agree with us as to the fact, that these gods are by the people themselves called *Shin*; so that, whatever the atheists may say, we may, from the mass of the people, obtain the testimony of the polytheists, as to what is the generic name for god in their language.

To prove that the views of the modern doctors are such as they are represented by Du Halde and M. Visdelou above, we shall give one or two extracts from the works of *Chú tsz*, the individual mentioned by Du Halde, as the prince of learning, and who has been well styled "the Standard of orthodoxy," with this sect of the learned.

Chú tsz's entire works, Sec. 49. p. 4. "If it be inquired, what is meant, when we read in the Shú King, (such sentences as the following, viz.) that "Sháng tí confers the due medium (virtuous nature) on the people," that "heaven is about to impose great duties on man;" that "heaven, to protect the people, makes for them princes:" that "heaven, having produced things, treats them according to their capacity; and upon those who do good, it sends down a hundred felicities; and upon those who do ill, it sends down a hundred calamities;" that "when heaven is about to send down some uncommon calamity, it first produces an uncommon man to determine it;" in expressions of this kind, is it meant that above the azure heavens there really is a ruler who acts thus; or is it that heaven

has no mind; or is it merely, if we seek the origin (or cause), that the *Lí* 理, order is thus (or according to the eternal fitness of things is it thus)? I (Chú tsz') answer: these *three points* have but one meaning, viz. according to (*Li*) order, or the eternal fitness of things it is thus. In the revolutions of the primordial substance hitherto, fullness has always been succeeded by decline, and after a period of decline there has been one of fullness, *just as if things were caused to go round in a circle.* There never has been a period of decline that was not followed by one of fullness."

This language is so clear that there is no mistaking the writer.

At the 25th page of the same section, we have these words: *Ti shí li wei chú*, 帝是理爲主, "Ruler means that (*li*) order or destiny is master."

Sentiments, that appear to differ very materially from those presented in the above extracts, are found in the works of this writer; but we think those above quoted are his real sentiments: he here speaks out; and his expressions that look another way are to be explained by these. Where *Chú tsz'* speaks of *Shàng tí* as a sovereign lord, &c., &c., he is expressing himself, we think, according to the prevailing sentiments of the polytheists of his day, but his own meaning was *Lí*, destiny.

We have detained the Reader, from our proofs, a long time by these quotations, but we trust he will regard them as well worth a careful perusal. We are sure he will find the facts, therein stated, of great importance, in forming an opinion on the question submitted to him.

Two important facts clearly appear: viz. that there are, in China, atheists and polytheists; and from Dr. Medhurst we learn that the mass of the people belong to the latter class: for we can scarcely regard a man as being at the same time an atheist and a polytheist.

This being the state of things, we cannot hesitate a moment as to which of these two classes we shall consult, when inquiring what is the generic name for God; for all men will answer with one voice, the theists, not the atheists.

We shall proceed, then, having informed the reader of this diversity of opinion to prove that the *t'ien* 天, worshiped at the winter solstice, is not the visible heavens, but is the *T'ien chí Shin*, 天之神, god or gods of heaven, and that this *T'ien chí Shin* 天之神, is called *Shàng tí*, the Ruler on high.

We said above that the most solemn sacrifice, offered in the na-

tional rites, is called *kiáu* 郊, and that this is offered to *T'ien* 天 heaven, and to *Ti* 地 Earth.

In *Káng-hi's* Dictionary we have the following definition of the word *kiáu*. "The name of a sacrifice. At the winter solstice, heaven is sacrificed to at the Southern *kiáu* or border; and at the summer solstice, earth is sacrificed to at the northern *kiáu* or border; therefore the sacrifice to heaven and Earth is called *kiáu*."

In the *Pei Wan Yun-fu*, the great Thesaurus prepared by the same scholars that made the Imperial Dictionary, in the reign of *Káng-hi*, we are told who the objects of worship are when *T'ien* 天 and *Ti* 地 are thus sacrificed to in the *kiáu* 郊. They quote the Ritual of the *Tsin* 晉 dynasty, about A. D. 350, in explanation of phrase *t'ien kiáu* 天郊, the *kiáu* sacrifice to heaven. The words are as follows: *t'ien kiáu so tsi, yueh huáng t'ien chí shin; ti kiáu so tsi, yueh huáng tí chí k'í; 天郊所祭曰皇天之禘地郊所祭曰皇地之祗*; "That which is sacrificed to in the *t'ien kiáu* (sacrifice to heaven) is called the god (*shin*) of Imperial Heaven; that which is sacrificed to in the *tí kiáu* (sacrifice to Earth) is called the god (*k'í*) of Imperial Earth."

We have translated *huáng t'ien chí shin*, 皇天之神 in the singular "god of Imperial Heaven," though there is nothing in the sentence itself to decide whether the word *Shin* is singular or plural; the reason that we here regard it as singular is that this *Shin* of heaven is called *Sháng tí*, and there can be but little doubt, we suppose, that the title *Sháng tí*, "ruler on high," is generally applied to a single Being: though we have the authority of *Chú tsz'* for saying that all the *Shin* of heaven are collectively called *Sháng tí*, the ruler or rulers on high. He makes this remark when commenting on the *kiáu teh sang* section of the *Lí Kí*: his object is to explain why *Hau-tsih*, the ancestor of the *Chau* dynasty, was paired with heaven, in the *kiáu* sacrifice. The reason assigned is, that as heaven is the root of all things, so an ancestor is the root of his posterity. For this reason, *Hau-tsih* was paired with heaven in the sacrifice at the winter solstice, and *Wan wáng* (the first monarch of the *Chau* dynasty) was paired with *Sháng tí* at the sacrifice in the ancestral temple called *Ming-tang*; after having stated these matters, he says, *Sháng tí, tsih t'ien yé; tsü t'ien chí shin rh yen chí, tseh wei chí sháng tí 上帝, 卽天也; 聚天之神而言之, 則謂之上帝*. *Sháng tí* is the same as heaven; if we collect

the gods of heaven and name them, then we call them *Sháng tí*, ruler on high," i. e. "if we speak of the gods of heaven collectively, we call them *Sháng tí*," in other words, the title *Sháng tí* is sometimes given to all the gods of heaven collectively, as well as to the chief god.

The Chinese student will find many instances where *t'ien*, heaven is used in the same way, for all the celestial *Shin*.

The point, we are now discussing, viz: that the *tien shin*, 天神, god or gods of heaven, and not the material Heavens, was the object to whom the *kiáu* sacrifice was offered, is so important that we shall trouble the reader with additional proofs:

Lí kí, Imperial Edition, sect. 36 p 1. In the text we read: "In the *kián* (the sacrifice to heaven) the three year old bullock was used, in the *shíé* and *tsih* (the sacrifice to the gods of the land and grain) a full grown ox was used."

The reason of this distinction in the victims, was to honour heaven more than the gods of the land and grain, for, says the commentator, "when the essence of a thing is brought forward, the smaller it is the better.

Commenting on the text above cited, *Kung Shí Yangtsh* 孔氏穎達, says "The god of Heaven (*t'ien Shin* 天神) is most honorable and (a Being) with whom nothing can be compared; therefore (in the *kiáu*, sacrifice) they used the three year old bullock; the meritorious services of the gods of the land and grain extend to men, and men rely upon these meritorious services, therefore they sacrifice the full grown ox to them by way of recompense."

Here we have direct testimony to the fact, that, the god (*Shin*) of heaven, who is beyond comparison the most honorable of all Beings, is the object worshiped in the *kiáu* sacrifice.

Commenting on the same passage *Chaushí Sū*, 周氏誥, a scholar of the Sung dynasty, who wrote before the time of *Chú tsz'* says, "When we speak of the *kiáu* sacrifice, the *Shin*, god or gods of Heaven (*t'ien shin*, 天神), and the *K'í*, god or gods of Earth" (are meant). In the preface of the Book of Odes, *Hau T'ien Yü ch'ing ming* 昊天有成命, section, it is said, in the *kiáu* they sacrifice to Heaven and Earth. In the *Shú King* it is said, "the victims used at the *kiáu* sacrifice were two bullocks; for one was used at the southern *kiáu* or border, to sacrifice to the *Shin*, god or gods of Heaven (*t'ien shin*, 天神); and one was used at the Northern *kiáu* or border, to sacrifice to the *K'í*, god or gods of Earth; thus for both the god (*Shin*) of Heaven and the god (*K'í*) of earth they used the three year old bullock."

The reader will observe that in this last quotation, the words *Shin* and *K'í* are translated as either singular or plural; in the original there is nothing to mark the number. For our purpose, it is not a matter of the slightest importance, whether the word *Shin*, in passages similar to the one above quoted, is considered as in the singular or plural: let it be either, and these quotations furnish clear and positive testimony to the fact, that, the object or objects worshiped at the winter solstice, the most solemn and highest sacrifice ever offered in China, is a Being or Beings called *Shin*.

We have seen above that by *T'ien*, Heaven, and *Sháng tí*, the Ruler on high, all parties agree that the same thing or Being is referred to.

Another method, therefore, of proving that the object worshiped in the *Kiáu* sacrifice, is not the material Heavens, but an invisible Being—a *Shin*,—is to shew that this sacrifice is offered to *Sháng tí* and that *Sháng tí* is a title given to the chief *Shin* or god.

In the *Chung Yung* 中庸, the second of the "Four Books," we read; "The rites of the *Kiáu* and *Shié* are the means whereby we serve *Sháng tí*, the Ruler on high, and (as the Commentator adds) the sovereign of Earth."

On this passage, the Commentator says, "In the *Kiáu* they sacrifice to Heaven and in the *Shié* they sacrifice to Earth; that the sovereign of Earth is not mentioned is owing to brevity of style."

We see here the Commentator regards *Sháng tí* as the same as *T'ien*, Heaven.

Another Commentator gives us the following explanation of the sacrifices *Kiáu* and *Shié*, *Yen kiáu tseh tung t'ien shin, yen shié tseh tung tí k'í* 言郊則統天神, 言社則統地祇. "If we speak of the *Kiáu* then (all) the celestial gods (*Shin*) are included, and when we speak of the *Shié*, then all the terrestrial gods (*K'í*) are included."

Here we see again that the objects worshiped in the *Kiáu* are the *T'ien Shin*, gods of Heaven. This commentator either regards *Sháng tí* as a title given to all the *T'ien Shin*, or regards the individual Being to whom this title is given as included in their number.

As the fact is so well known that the *Kiáu* sacrifice is offered to *Sháng tí*, having cited one proof of this fact, we will not occupy more time upon it, but proceed to prove that *Sháng tí* is called a *Shin*, and is included among the class of Beings worshiped under that name.

In the *Wu King Tung* 五經通義, quoted in the *Yuen Kien Lui Han*, 禮鑑類函 we read *T'ien Shin chí tá ché, yueh hau t'ien Sháng tí; yih yueh t'ien hwáng tá tí; yih yueh tái yih: 天神之大者曰昊天上帝亦曰天皇帝亦曰太一* "The greatest of the celestial gods (*T'ien Shin*) is called Expansive Heaven, the Ruler on high. * He is also called the celestial, august, great Ruler; also the Great one."

In the *Pai Pien* 陔編, quoted in the work above mentioned we meet with the following: *Hau Han Hiau wan tí, í t'ien hwáng tá tí, wú tí, wei luh tsung; yü í wei táng, ho ché? Chau Lí í yen sz' hau t'ien Sháng tí, tsh yen sz' tsái sz' t'ien, puh shuh pieh shin; yü sz' fuh sz' hau t'ien Sháng tí, tá k'iu 'rh mien, sz' wú tí yih jú chí; hau t'ien Sháng tí nái peh shin chí tsun; tsung chí í yé.* 後漢孝文帝,以天皇帝,五帝爲六宗,于義爲當何者,周禮以禋祀昊天上帝,則禋祀在祀天,不屬別神,又司服祀昊天上帝,大裘而冕祀五帝亦如之,昊天上帝乃百神之尊宗之義也。

* We translate *hau t'ien sháng tí*, 昊天上帝, "Expansive Heaven, the Ruler on high," and not "The Supreme Ruler of the Expansive Heavens," as the phrase is usually translated. The reason is, that *T'ien* and *Sháng tí* being only, the first the name, and the second the title given to the same Power, *T'ien* and *Sháng tí* must be construed in apposition, as we cannot regard a Power as the Ruler of itself. Commenting on the text, *í yen sz' sz' hau tien sháng tí*, 以淵祀祀昊天上帝, of *Chau Lí* sec. 18, page 2, *Ching tsz'* says, *tien yü tí yih yé, tien yen kí tí, tí yen kí chú*, 天與帝一也天言其體帝言其主, *T'ien* (Heaven) and *Tí* (the Ruler) are the same. (The name) Heaven refers to its (the Ruling Power's) substance, and (the title) *tí* the Ruler refers to its ruling."

This explanation takes no notice of the qualifying words "*Hau*," "*Expansive*," and "*Sháng*" "on high," and simply tells us that *T'ien* and *Tí*, in the phrase quoted above from the *Chau Lí*, are the same, from which we must infer that they are in apposition.

The meaning of these words "*Hau*," 昊 and "*Sháng*," 上, are thus explained by *Chingshí Nghoh*, 饒氏鄭, when commenting on the same passage of the *Chau Lí*. He says, *í kí k'í chí hau hau, kú yueh hau t'ien; í kí chú wei hú sháng, kú yueh sháng í,* 以其氣之浩浩故曰昊天,以其主位乎上,故曰上帝. "Because of the immensity of its substance, we call it (the ruling Power) Expansive Heaven; because its ruling seat is on high, we call it (the Power above called Expansive Heaven) *Shang tí*, i. e. the Ruler on high."

The Emperor Hâu Wan of the after Hân dynasty supposed that the celestial, august, great Ruler and the five Rulers were the six venerated objects (to whom *Shun* sacrificed): his idea was correct. Why so? In the *Chau Li* we read, that they used the pure offering to sacrifice to Expansive Heaven, the Ruler on high, thus in the pure offering they offered a sacrifice to heaven (alone), *it did not belong to any other god (Shin)*; and (we read) also that the officer when sacrificing to Bright Heaven, the Ruler on high, wore the great fur robe and imperial cap, and that in sacrificing to the five Rulers he wore the same dress: Expansive Heaven, the Ruler on high, is the most Honorable of all the gods (literally hundred *Shin*); this is the meaning of the venerated objects."

In the *Shi King*, *Sián Yé*, *Ching Yueh*, 正月 section, p. 21, we are expressly told that, "Sháng tí is the god of Heaven," *Sháng tí t'ien chí shin yé*, 上帝天之神也。

Lí Kí, Imperial Edition, section, 8 p. 15., We read *T'ien shin yú luh; tsí chí yih sui yú kiú; háu t'ien sháng tí, tung chí tsí chí, yih yé*, 天神有六祭之一歲有九, 昊天上帝, 冬至祭之一也。 "The celestial gods (*Shin*) are six, they are sacrificed to nine times in a year: Expansive Heaven, the Ruler on high, who is sacrificed to at the Winter solstice, is the first;" and then follow the, *wú tí* 五帝, Five Rulers. We have the same statement repeated in the commentary on the *Chau Lí* section 22nd p. 30. Nothing can be more distinct and formal than these statements.

5. In Mencius, Edition called *Sz' Shú Pú chu pí chí*, 四書補註備旨, Vol. 6. p. 29. we read, "If the ugliest person were to practise fasting and bathing, he could then sacrifice to *Sháng tí*." The critical note says. "*Sháng tí* is the most honorable of all the gods (*Shin*)," *Sháng tí chí tsun chí shin*. 上帝至尊之神. This says, as plainly as language can, that, *Sháng tí* is the most honorable one of the class of Beings called *Shin*.

Tai Yé Yun Hân, 雲漢. Ode p. 12. Text, *hán kí tá shin &c.*, 旱既太甚, &c. "The drought is great and the heat intense. We have not ceased to offer sacrifices, from the *kiáu* sacrifice (to Heaven and Earth) to that presented in the ancestral temple. To the gods above (celestial), to the gods below (terrestrial), we have made offerings and interred their victims. *There is not a god (Shin) we have not honored*: *Huutsih* (our ancestor) is not able and *Sháng tí* does not come down to our relief."

A critical note says, "*Shin* in the phrase, 'there is not a god (*Shin*) we have not honored,' only refers to those worshiped in the *kiáu* and in the ancestral temple, for the sacrifices constantly offered were only those at the *kiáu* border of the country, and in the ancestral temple." We have seen, in a previous part of this paper, that Heaven, or *Sháng tí* and Earth, were worshiped in the *kiáu*. The worship of these is here included in the single word *Shin* and as the author of the critical note plainly implies all the Beings constantly sacrificed to.

The Commentator says; "In the *kiáu* they sacrifice to the celestial and terrestrial gods; and then gives us this explanation of the whole:" The Poet means that *Hautsih* (his ancestor) wished to rescue them from the calamities of the drought, but was not able. He mentions *Hautsih* because of his nearness of kin, and the Ruler, because he was the most honorable (*Shin* addressed).

The Commentator here, evidently, intends to account for the fact that, although all the gods of Heaven and Earth are sacrificed to, yet the poet only notices the failure of *Sháng tí* and *Hautsih* to answer their prayers; the reason is, he, says, that one is the relation of the parties praying, and the other, the most honorable of the class of Beings addressed.

The paraphrase is very full and makes it unmistakeably plain, that the *Shin*, (which occurs in the phrase, 'there is not a god we have not honored,') is used, as the general name of all the Beings worshiped on the occasion of this great public calamity. It is as follows: "The drought is very great, and the heat most intense and burns to such a degree as to cause sickness among the people. I, because of the people's distress, seek assistance from (*Shin*) the gods. To every one that can be sacrificed to, I have not ceased to make offerings, from the *kiáu* in which I sacrificed to the gods of Heaven and Earth, to the ancestral temple where I sacrificed to my ancestors; whether looking to those above I sacrificed to the celestial (gods), or looking to those below I sacrificed to the terrestrial (gods); whether at the commencement of the sacrifice I offered up the ceremonies due to them, or the sacrifice ended, I interred their victims;—for there is not a god (*Shin*) to whom I have not exhausted the way of honoring and reverencing him. Now of the gods (*Shin*), of the ancestral temple, there is none more to be honored than *Hautsih*: although he has never failed to enjoy my offerings, still his strength is not sufficient to overcome the calamity; of the gods (*Shin*) sacrificed to in the *kiáu* sacrifice there is none more to be honored than *Sháng tí*, his

strength sufficient to overcome the calamity, but he still does not enjoy (or favorably receive) my offerings.”

We desire to call the Reader's attention particularly to this quotation from the Book of Odes; for we think it would of itself, if we had no other evidence, fully sustain our position, that *Shin* is the generic name for God in Chinese. We have here an occasion of deep distress, a great public calamity; man is made to feel his weakness; he calls on his gods for aid. Surely this is the occasion on which to learn the name given to the whole class of *Beings worshiped*, if the Chinese have such a word. We find, in this ode, the plainest evidence that they have the generic name we seek for, and that this name is *Shin*; and the Poet himself and all his Commentators, not only use *Shin* as the general name of all the Beings worshiped, but also expressly tell us that *Sháng tí* the chief god is one of this class.

We have more than a hundred references to passages, in the classical books, now before us, in which *Sháng tí* is either directly called a *Shin* or indirectly referred to as a *Shin*. We shall not, however, cite them for fear of wearying the Reader's attention; more evidence, on this point, could not increase his conviction that *Sháng tí* is a *Shin*. The quotations, given above, state this so directly and clearly, that he must either conclude the writers I have quoted, know nothing of the matter, or that the fact is as I have stated it, viz. that the chief god of the Chinese is by them included among the class of Beings called *Shin*.

We shall, therefore, give only one more quotation to prove this point. *Yen tsz'* thus addresses Duke Hwan: if the chaplain were to speak the truth, he would blame your highness severely; but should he screen and hide your faults, he would be attempting to deceive the Ruler on high. If the Ruler on high be a god (*Shin*) then he cannot be deceived, *but if he be not (Shin) a god it would be of no use to pray to him.*”

Here we are not only told that *Sháng tí* is a *Shin*, but what is still more to our purpose, viz: that it is of no use *to pray* to any Being who is not a *Shin*.

We cannot conclude this second division of our subject without referring once more to the ritual of the Chau dynasty: for we rely much upon the evidence this work affords us, that all the Beings worshiped in the national rites were included in one of the three classes called *Shin*, *K'í*, and *Kwei*.

The evidence cited above was derived from a consideration of the duties of the *Tsung p'eh*, the chief Baron, who superintended the na-

tional sacrifices. We shall now, by a reference to the office of the 大 祝, *tá chuh* Great Chaplain, shew that the prayers used in the national worship, were all addressed to the *Shin*, *K'í*, *K'wei*, and prove from the Commentators, that the chief god of the Chinese is included among the Beings contained in this enumeration.

The duties of this office are thus described in the 25th section of the *Chau Li*: The Great Chaplain superintends (the offering up of) the six forms of prayer to serve the *K'wei*, *Shin*, *K'í*, to pray for happiness, and to entreat constant purity. The first prayer is called the *Shun chuh*; 2d The *Nien chuh*; 3d *Keih chuh*; 4th The *Hwá chuh*; 5th The *Lui chuh*; 6th The *Kieh chuh*.

The first question to be here asked is, to whom are these prayers addressed? The second is, what are the blessings, to obtain which, these prayers were offered?

To the first question we answer, these prayers, we find from the text are addressed to the three classes of Beings called severally *K'wei*, *Shin* and *K'í*. Who are included in these general names? The Commentators tell us 1st. in general terms; that, "the six forms of prayer were used at the *kiáu*, when they sacrificed to Heaven, and Earth, and to the gods of the land and grain: and at the sacrifices offered in the ancestral temple." Thus we see all the objects, usually worshiped by the Chinese in their national rites, are included; for, as the Commentator on the book of odes has told us above, "the Sacrifices constantly offered, were only those of the *kiáu* and of the ancestral temple." Secondly, we are told particularly, that the *nien chuh*, the annual prayer, the second form mentioned above, was used "to pray to Shángtí and the gods of the land and grain for the bestowal of grain."

Secondly. What are the blessings for which these prayers were offered? The Commentators answer: The first prayer was for a prosperous, plentiful year; 2d, was to pray for constant purity; 3d, was for happiness and felicitous omens; 4th, was to escape calamities and war; 5th, was for favorable winds and seasonable rain; 6th was a prayer to remove far from them their sins and sicknesses.

Another Commentator, explaining the fifth prayer, makes the following observation: "The men of the olden time, if they obtained blessings, were sure to ascribe the merit to (*Shin*) the gods."

The duties of the Great Chaplain are thus further described, in the next sentence of the text.

"He superintends the offering up of the, *luh kí*, 六 祈, six supplications to harmonize the *K'wei*, *Shin*, *K'í*. The 1st was call-

ed *Lui*; 2d *Tsáu*; 3d *Kwei*; 4th *Ying*; 5th *Chung*; and the 6th was called *Shwoh*.

The Commentator explaining the word *kí*, 祈, says, it is the same as 鳴 *wú*, to cry out. "It means," he says, "that because they had calamities they cried out and informed the gods (*Shin*) to beg for happiness."

These services are thus explained by the Commentators. The first, *Lui*, is said to be a sacrifice to *Sháng tí*; The 2d, *Tsáu*, is a sacrifice to ancestors; the 4th, *Ying*, is thus explained; "with respect to the gods (*Shin*) of the sun, moon and stars, should there be untimely snow, thunder, wind and rain, this sacrifice, called *Ying*, was offered to them; and with respect to the gods (*Shin*) of the hills and marshes, when there was calamity from floods or drought, plague, or pestilence, then the sacrifice called *Ying* was offered to them."

Here again we see that *Sháng tí*, the chief god, is specially mentioned as one of the *Shin* to whom these services were offered. It is also plain, from the above extracts, that the (*Shin*) gods were invoked in all times of calamity and that from them all kinds of blessings were sought by prayer. Among the calamities, from which deliverance was prayed for, the Reader's attention is called to the fact, that, sins and sicknesses are specially mentioned.

3. The conclusion we draw, from the facts proved above is: *that the class of Beings called Shin being the highest class worshiped by the Chinese, must be regarded as the gods of China, and Shin as the generic name for God in the Chinese language.*

Every thing here depends upon the sense in which the word God is used. If the word God is understood to mean, a self-existent, eternal, almighty Being, the Creator of heaven and earth, &c., as this word is usually defined by Christians, we are quite aware that our premises do not warrant the conclusion we have drawn from them, viz: that *Shin* means God. But we are not contending that *Shin* means the true God, or was ever used by the Chinese to designate such a Being as the one described above. On the contrary, we are full persuaded they have no knowledge of a self-existent, eternal, almighty Being, who created heaven and earth; and we understand this point to be distinctly admitted by those who oppose the use of *Shin* to render θεός into Chinese. We only maintain that *Shin* is the generic or appellative name of God in Chinese, that it means god "in the sense of heathen nations," that it answers to θεός and *Deus* as those words were used by Greek and Roman polytheists.

Although we admit that the word *Shin* is never used by the Chinese to designate the self-existent almighty Being who made heaven and earth, still we contend that the highest Being, *they have ever conceived of*, is included in the class called *Shin*.

As so much depends here upon the meaning attached to the word God, we shall sustain the propriety of the sense, in which we use the phrase, "generic name for God," by the citation of a few of the highest authorities on this subject.

Cudworth thus defines the pagan notion of the word God. He says:

"This is that, which seems to be essentially included in the pagan notion of the word god or gods, *when taken in general* (i. e. generically), namely a respect to religious *worship*. Wherefore a god, *in general*, according to the sense of pagan theists, may be thus defined: "An understanding Being superior to men, not originally derived from senseless matter and looked upon as an object for men's *religious worship*." *Cudworth's Intel. System* Vol. I. p. 373.

Mosheim thus expressed his views, of what constitutes polytheism and the meaning of the word god, in the sense of polytheists.

"In order to arrive at a clear view of the matter, it ought to be determined in the first instance, what is meant by "believing in the existence of many gods." In my opinion, he alone believes in a plurality of gods, who not only admits the existence of many Beings more powerful, more noble, and more excellent than mankind, but inculcates that men ought to pay a certain homage and offer sacrifice to these Beings: For we are not to rank any one among the worshippers of many gods who simply supposes many Beings to exist far superior to men in power, strength, wisdom and other attributes. For in that case all Christians, who, agreeably to sacred writ, believe in the existence of God's messengers or angels would have to be included in this class. There must be superadded an opinion, that it is the duty of all men to propitiate these natures with divine worship and ceremonies." *Dr. J. L. Mosheim. Notes on Cudworth*, vol. 2. p. 80.

We shall only add to the above the opinion of Waterland:

"The pagans, though they professed generally (as is well known to the learned) *one only supreme God*, looking upon all the rest as *subordinate* ministers of the one supreme, yet stand charged with polytheism by the Jews, by the ancient Christians, and by the common consent of mankind. Thus Jupiter and Mercury (though one was supposed a subordinate minister of the other) were, by the Lycaonians, spoken of in the plural number as gods; that is, two gods."

Acts 14: 11,12. And this has been the common way of speaking, in all the writers I have met with, sacred or profane, ancient or modern. But what if the customary usage of language had been otherwise: does this writer imagine the dispute is only about a name? To extricate this matter, polytheism may be considered either in a stricter or larger sense: it may either signify the belief of more gods than one, in the proper sense of necessarily existing, supreme, &c., (in which sense, there have been few, very few polytheists: the pagans themselves, generally, were not polytheists in this sense; or it may signify the receiving of more gods than one, in respect of *religious worship*, whatever opinion of these gods they may otherwise have. *It is this kind of polytheism which the first Commandment has chiefly respect to*, and it is the same that Pagans, Arians, and Socinians stand justly charged with. Should any man alter the *name*, the thing would be the same still." *Waterland's Works*, vol. 2. p. 19,20.

We see then, according to these writers, that an intelligent Being superior to man, who is made an object of *religious worship*, must be regarded as a god, in the sense in which this word is understood by pagans. We suppose it will not be denied that this is the sense in which the word *Elohim* is to be understood in the second clause of the First Commandment.

We shall now recapitulate some of the chief points proved, in the preceding part of this Essay, that the Reader may see how fully the *Shin* answer all the requirements of these definitions.

We have seen that in the time of *Shun* B. C. 2169, there was an officer appointed to attend to the three ceremonies, used in the national worship, and that the three classes of Beings worshiped, in these national rites, were called respectively *Shin*, *Kwei*, and *K'i*. That under the *Shâng* dynasty, B. C. 1710, according to the speech of *E-yun*, these same three classes of Beings were worshiped; that according to the Ritual of the *Chau* dynasty, the objects then (B. C. 1100) worshiped were designated by the same names, *viz: Shin*, *K'i*, and *Kwei*. We learned further, from this Ritual, that the Beings belonging to these three classes are "the most honorable in the universe," and that of these three classes, *to all of whom religious worship was offered*, the class called *Shin* is the most honorable; that the single word *Shin* is used alone, as appears from the phrase "gods and men," from the Ode quoted, and from the express declaration of the Commentator, to include all the members of the three classes and *indeed every object of religious worship*. We have seen that the object

worshiped in the *kiâu* Sacrifice, at the winter solstice, the most solemn and highest sacrifice ever offered in China, is "the *Shin* (God) of imperial heaven;" and that the chief god of the Chinese, whether designated by his name *T'ien*, "Heaven," or by his title *Shang ti*, "Ruler on high," is expressly included among the class of Beings called *Shin*.

These facts, it appears to us, fully warrant the conclusion we have drawn from them, viz: "that the class of Beings called *Shin*, being the highest class worshiped by the Chinese, must be regarded as the gods of China, and *Shin* as the generic name for God in the Chinese language."

IN the foregoing part of this Essay, we have endeavored, by an appeal to the *usus loquendi* of the word *Shin* in the classical works of the Chinese, to ascertain its meaning when used as a concrete noun; and we think have shown it is used, by these writers, as the appellative name of God.

Ernesti, after having told us that the *usus loquendi* may be known by testimony direct or indirect, gives the following rule for obtaining direct testimony. "Direct testimony may be obtained," he says, "first, from the writers to whom the language is vernacular; next, from those who, though foreigners, have learned the language in question; and third, from Dictionaries, &c., made by those acquainted with the language."

We have already pursued the first means, recommended above, to as great length as we suppose it could answer any good purpose to go; and shall now, inverting the order recommended by Ernesti, produce evidence from the Dictionaries prepared by foreigners and from the writings of missionaries, to sustain the meaning we have assigned to the word *Shin*.

The testimony thus elicited, notwithstanding some diversity of phraseology on the part of the Romish missionaries, agrees so entirely in regarding *Shin*, in one of the senses in which it is used, as the name of a class of Beings (to which class we have proved the Chinese offer religious worship) that we think it entitled to great weight from its uniformity.

The Reader is requested to bear in mind that we are not contending that the word *Shin* means God in the proper sense of necessarily existing, supreme, &c.; but that it is the appellative or generic name of God: in the language of Cadworth, that it is the name of a class of "understanding Beings, superior to men, and looked upon as objects of men's religious worship," and not only so, but that they are the highest class of Beings that are so regarded by the Chinese.

We turn first to the Dictionary of Dr. Morrison, published in 1819. This word is thus defined in his Chinese and English Dictionary: "Every evanescent, invisible, inscrutable, spiritual, operating *power* or *cause* is called *Shin*. A Spirit; the human Spirit. Divinity. God, in the sense of heathen nations. Divine; Spiritual; the animal spirits."

We have here, among the meanings given, the exact one for which we contend, "God in the sense of heathen nations."

In the English and Chinese part of his Dictionary, the Doctor thus renders the word God: "God or the *deus* of the Chinese, was originally, and is still most generally *Shin* 神; in the plural *Dii*, *Shin kwei* 神鬼 and *Shin ke* 神祇. A sort of Supreme God is, in the ancient books, expressed by *Shang te*. Genii of particular places are also expressed by *Shin*, as *ho shin*, 河神 god of the river; *shan Shin*, 山神 god of the hill, &c.; all these gods are, in Chinese notions, inferior to *t'ien*, 天. Heaven," &c.

These inferior deities, though at first by the Doctor called *genii*, are afterwards by him correctly rendered gods, as they are all objects of *religious worship*.

We next cite the works of Dr. Medhurst, by whose diligence we have been furnished with three dictionaries.

The first, the Hok-keen, was published in 1832. In it, the character *sin*, 神 (mandarin *Shin*,) is thus explained:

"A god, a spirit. *Shin ming*, 神明, the gods; *chin shin*, 眞神, the true God; *Shin huân*, 神魂, the human Spirit and soul."

In the second, his Chinese and English Dictionary, published in 1842, the word *Shin* is thus explained:

"The celestial gods, who draw forth or develop all things." "*Shin ming* 神明, superior beings, the immortal gods. *Kwei shin*, 鬼

神, gods and demons." "See *shin*, 事神, to serve the gods." "Tse *shin*, 祭神 to sacrifice to the gods." "Theen *shin jin kwai*, 天神人鬼, the gods of heaven and the spirits of men." "Peh *shin*, 百神, the hundred gods," &c., &c.,

The word *Shin* has other meanings given in this Dictionary, but as we are only illustrating its meaning when used as a *concrete noun* we do not quote them, as these meanings do not at all affect the question we are now discussing.

We next quote Dr. Medhurst's English and Chinese Dictionary, which was published in 1847. As this is the last production of Dr. Medhurst, compiled by him after thirty years study of the language, and with the benefit derived from the labor of all preceding European scholars, we shall extract every thing that he has written under the word "God," and beg to call the Reader's particular attention to the testimony which Dr. Medhurst gives as to the words which "the Chinese themselves" use for "gods in general."

GOD, the Supreme Being, 上帝 *Shing té*, 天帝 *t'heen té*; the most high God, 皇皇上帝 *huáng huáng Sháng té*; according to the Romanists, 天主 *t'heen choh*; according to the Mohammedans, 主 *c'oh*, 真主, *chín choh*: some Protestant writers have used, 神 *Shín*, 神天 *Shín t'heen*, 神主 *Shín choh*, 真活神 *chín huó shín*; THE CHINESE THEMSELVES for gods, or invisible beings in general, use 神 *Shín*, 神祇 *Shín kè*, 鬼神 *kwai shín*, 神明 *Shín míng*, 神仙 *Shín sēn*; the gods of the hills, 山神 *san shín*; the gods of the rivers, 河神 *hó shín*; the gods of the land and grain, 社稷 *shay ts'ih*; the gods of the heavens, 天神, *t'heen shín*; the gods of the earth, 地祇 *té kè*; the god of learning, 魁星 *kwai sing*; the god of the winds, 十八姨 *shih p'á c*; the god of water, 司寒 *sze han*; the god of rain, 屏翳 *ping é*; the eyes of the gods are like lightning, 神目如電 *Shín mǔh jō t'ēn*; to swear before the gods, 神前發誓, *Shín ts'ēn fā shé*; the mercy of the gods, 神之慈悲, *Shín chē tze pei*; the protection of the gods, 鬼神之助祐 *kwai shín che tsōo y'w*; may the gods protect you, 敬靈庇祐, *Shín ling pí y'w*; respect the gods, but keep them at a distance, 敬鬼神而遠之 *king kwai shín t'oh yuán che*; the gods are like men, 神與人同 *Shín*

yü jîn t'ung; to regulate the gods and men. 治神人 *chê shên jîn*; a god, in the language of the Buddhists, 菩薩 *poo sã*; the god Buddha, 神佛 *shên fuk*; the god of the furnace, 籠神 *tsabu shên*; local gods, 土地神 *t'hoó t'ê shên*; sacrifice to the gods, as though present, 祭神如在 *tse shên job tsae*; names of gods, 伽藍 *kêa lân*; 句芒 *kow máng*, 句龍 *kow lóng*, 竈罔 *tsabu yaou*, 天恩 *t'héen yü*"

In connection with this extract from Dr. Medhurst's last Dictionary, two points, which are of the utmost importance in our present inquiry, claim attention. The first is, that Dr. Medhurst, after having told us what words the various foreigners who have written in Chinese used for God, tells us, in express terms, that *the Chinese themselves, for gods, and invisible beings in general, use "Shin 神;"* in other words, that native writers use *Shin* as the appellative name of God. The second is, that Dr. Medhurst, in all this long article, says not one word of the Chinese using *Ti*, 帝, as the general name of gods, or of any class of invisible beings. This last mentioned fact we think one of great importance; for if *Ti* be so clearly the appellative name of God, in Chinese, that we should be authorized to use it in our translation to render *θεός*, how can the fact be accounted for that two such scholars as Dr. Morrison, (for he too, under the word "God" makes no mention of *Ti* as the appellative name of God,) and Dr. Medhurst, should have known nothing of it after so long and diligent a study of the language?

On the supposition that *Ti* not *Shin* (as we understand is now maintained by the opponents of *Shin*.) is the appellative name of God in Chinese, how can we account for the fact that they both give *Shin* as this appellative and not *Ti*? Though it may be admitted that this fact is not conclusive evidence that *Ti* is not the appellative name of God in Chinese, yet surely it is the strongest *prima facie* evidence against *Ti* and entitles us to call for very clear and unequivocal testimony to rebut it. To rebut the very strong presumption against *Ti*, that arises from this fact, those who now contend that *Ti* is the generic term for God in Chinese, should point out clearly how it was that Drs. Morrison and Medhurst in common with all other European students of the Chinese language, have been for so long time under a delusion with respect to the meaning of a word so constantly met with as the character *Ti* 帝; for as we shall see, in the sequel, all have agreed in rendering *Ti* Emperor, Ruler, and no one, previous

to the last four or five months, ever thought of giving it as the appellative name of God!

Of the Dictionaries prepared by missionaries of the Romish church, we have only one, that of M. J. M. Callery. He therein defines the word *Shin*, Esprit, Genie, Idole, Mystère.

M. De Guignés, we understand, also renders it Esprit, Genié, &c., &c.

These works have been prepared since the decision of the Roman See, that "*T'ien Choo*" shall be used for God.

These two last mentioned lexicographers agree with us as to the fact that *Shin* is the name of a class of invisible beings; they say nothing with respect to their being or not being objects of religious worship; but this fact we have abundantly proved, and it is denied by no one. Whether they would have regarded the *Shin* as gods, in the sense in which Cudworth and Mosheim and Waterland define the word "God," as used by polytheists, we have no means of deciding; but presume they would, as they knew the *Shin* were objects of religious worship. The contrary should not be inferred from their using the words *Esprit* and *Genie*, as we have shown above that although P. Amiot—in answer to M. De Guignes' question, "What are the *national divinities* of the Chinese?"—answers *Shin*, yet translates the words throughout his paper *Esprit*.

M. Visdelou gives us his views on this subject at some length, which may be in accordance with that of the other members of this Church. He says:

"A l'égard du terme Chin (*Shin*) soit qu'il soit seul, on ainsi reuni à Kweichin; aucun de nos termes ne peut le rendre parfaitement, si on le traduit par Esprits, ce n'est pas assez, si on le traduit par le mot de Dieux, c'est trop." "Les Chinois ont plusieurs idées ou notions de Chin (*Shin*). 1. Quand c'est en général qu'on en parle, *l'une est général*, et alors elle signifie une certaine vertu divine, excellente et incompréhensible, et l'on honore de ce titre les hommes extraordinaires dont la sainteté surpasse la condition humaine: *l'autre est particulière*, et cette appellation convient alors *aux Etres seuls qui sont révéérés par des sacrifices*, tels que sont les Genies célestes les Esprits terrestres, et les manes des morts: auquel cas, pour éviter toute équivoque on les nomme Kwei-chin (*Kwei-shin*). Or cette notion des Kwei-chin *en tant qu'elle regarde les Dieux seuls* est morale et populaire; et ceux qui l'admettent attribuent des intelligences à tous les corps de l'univers et aux manes des morts sans se mettre en peine si ces formes sont véritablement

informantes, ou purement assistantes." He then mentions a physical and philosophical sense in which the words *Kwei-shin* are to be sometimes understood and adds: "quand j'ai parle d'une notion des Dieux morale et populaire, il ne faut pas penser qu'elle appartienne seulement au peuple, et nullement aux philosophes," &c. 2. Quand c'est par opposition que l'on parle des Chin (*Shin*) on établit alors *trois ordres* de Dieux, dont les célestes sont nommés Chin, les terrestres Kí, et les manes de morts Kwei. En égard à cette distinction, on peut traduire Chin par Genies; Kí par Esprits; et Kwei, par manes des morts; quoique dans le fond, nos termes ne quadrent pas parfaitement aux terms Chinois."

From the second class of meanings of *Shin*, given by M. Visdelon above, it will be perceived that the difference between him and ourselves is more in phraseology than any thing else. Though he does not scruple to call the *Shin* Dieux, he prefers Genie. The same may be said of P. Amiot; and we presume M. Callery and M. De Guignes used the word Genie in the same sense. As we have said above, we do not contend that *Shin* means God in the proper sense of necessarily existing, supreme, &c., but have expressed our opinion that the Chinese have never conceived of such a Being,* and have, therefore, no name for Him, and have strengthened this opinion by a quotation from Dr. Medhurst's "China, its State and Prospects," in which he asserts, without any qualification, that the Chinese "account no divinity to be eternal."

This being the case, as it is admitted on all hands that the *Shin* are the objects of *religious worship*, and as we have clearly shown that they are the highest of the three classes into which the Chinese divide the invisible beings, who are the objects of this worship, it would be a mere quarrel about words to contend whether we shall call them Genii, Spirits or Gods; for we agree wholly with Mosheim that a spirit, who is the *object of religious worship*, must be accounted a god in the pagan sense of the word, and we may add, in the sense of the first commandment also.

As we have clearly shown that the chief object, to whom the Chinese offer religious worship, is a *Shin*, to translate *Shin*, Genii, and maintain that it never means a god or gods, by the plainest consequence denies that the Chinese have any gods at all: for if the high-

* The Chinese have not anywhere, in the classical Books, that we are aware of, given any account of the origin of the *Shin* or of *Shóng tí*; and, on the contrary, there are no passages which affirm the self-existence or eternity of either *Shóng tí*, or any other of the Beings, who are included in the class called *Shin*.

est object of their religious worship is to be reckoned only as one of the class called Genii, the inferior objects cannot be any thing more. We have shown that *Sbáng tí* is the most honorable of the *Shin*, and if *Shin* is here translated either Genii or Gods, it is the same to us: in either case, *Shin* is the name of the highest class of Beings to whom the Chinese offer religious worship, and therefore the best term in the language affords us by which to render *Elohim* and $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$. But if Cudworth and Mosheim and Waterland are correct, *Shin* must be rendered a god or gods.

To the question, "What is the generic name for God in the Chinese language?" put in a previous part of this paper, we replied, "We answer with Morrison and Milne and Marshman, *Shin*:" and we might have added, according to the Chinese works of Dr. Medhurst and Mr. Gutzlaff, and the testimony of all Protestant missionaries who have composed works in this language, the appellative name of God in Chinese is *Shin*.

The proof of this point, by an appeal to the Chinese writings of the missionaries will furnish us with Ernesti's third direct testimony to the *usus loquendi* of *Shin*.

That Drs. Morrison, Milne, and Marshman used *Shin*, as the generic or appellative name of God in Chinese, we shall make no quotations from their writings to prove, as the fact is well known that they used *Shin* in their translations to render *Elohim* and $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in all cases, whether the true god or a false god was referred to by these words.

After the publication of these Versions, a dissatisfaction with the use of *Shin* as the rendering of $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, when this word referred to the true God was felt; and in the translation of the New Testament prepared by Dr. Medhurst, $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, when referring to the true God, was rendered by the phrase *Sháng tí*, which phrase the Doctor has always translated "Supreme Ruler." In this rendering he was followed by Mr. Gutzlaff in his translation. Thus, the name (or as we contend, the *title*) of the chief God of the Chinese was used for the true God, and another word was used to render $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ when the reference was to a false god or gods. If what we have advanced in the first part of this Essay on the necessity for using the appellative name of God to render $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in all cases, be correct, then a very great mistake was made in using *Sháng tí*, and in rendering $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in different contexts by different Chinese words. But this way of rendering $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ was concurred in by nearly all the Missionaries, by the writer of this Essay among the number, and there was no opposition made to the use of

Sháng tí, until a revision of existing translations was called for. This call caused all questions connected with the differences which existed between the Versions of Drs. Morrison and Medhurst to undergo a careful examination, and the position was maintained that the generic or appellative name of God should be used to render *θεος* in all cases.

As soon as the attention of the Missionaries was called to this point, the truth of this proposition was, we believe, generally admitted, and it was as generally acknowledged that the compound phrase "*Sháng tí*," "Supreme Ruler," or "Ruler on High," could not be the appellative name of God in Chinese, and accordingly the use of *Sháng tí* has ceased to be advocated *by all*, with whose opinion we are acquainted.

The phrase, which the great majority of the missionaries had previously used for the true God, being thus abandoned, and the question with respect to the rendering of *θεος* narrowed down to the single inquiry, What is the appellative name of God in Chinese, many, who had formerly agreed on this subject in all respects, found themselves now divided on this *new issue*. Some of those, who had previously used "*Shang tí*," maintained in accordance (as we shall show) with the previous usage of all the missionaries, that *Shin* was the appellative sought for; while others brought forward a perfectly new term, which neither they themselves nor any others, so far as we have been able to learn, had ever regarded, before this exigency, as the appellative name of God in Chinese.

To prove that *Shin* was used by all the missionaries as the appellative name of God, it is necessary for us to quote (as we have done above in the case of Dr. Medhurst's Dictionaries) the works of the living against the position they now maintain. We therefore think it right to state distinctly, that we do not make these quotations to reproach our Missionary Brethren, who advocate the use of *Ti*, with any inconsistency in this matter; for we ourselves, in common with most of those who advocate the use of *Shin* to render *θεος* in all cases, have changed our opinion as to *Sháng tí* as we have said above. The sincere Christian regard and respect we entertain for these Brethren and the entire confidence we have that they, in common with all the Missionaries, have but one desire, which is to set forth the Gospel of Christ, forbid us to be influenced by any such motive. And moreover we are fully persuaded, that, for such fallible mortals as we all are, the only true course of consistency is to abandon error as soon as it is perceived and to adhere to what we at

present believe to be truth, until we see reason to doubt of its truthfulness.

In this appeal to the Dictionaries and writings of the Missionaries we have three objects. *First* to show, that, the ablest Protestant Missionaries, both dead and living, have regarded and used *Shin* as the appellative name of God, in order that, what we regard as the truth in the premises, may derive from thence the strong corroboration afforded by the entire uniformity of opinion which existed previous to this late division, as to what was the appellative name of God in Chinese; and especially to shew, that those who have uniformly opposed the use of *Shin* for the true God, still regarded and used *Shin* as the appellative name of God in Chinese. Our *second object*, in making this appeal, is, in respect to the living, to prevent their great experience and knowledge of the language being quoted as *authority* against us, by shewing they have constantly testified that *Shin* was the appellative name of God in Chinese, until within the last few months. Our *third object* is, by shewing the facts we have above stated, to throw upon the advocates of *Ti* the whole *onus probandi*, inasmuch as they bring forward a perfect novelty—one to which they were themselves strangers in the early part of 1847, and one against which they have so recently borne the strongest negative testimony.

If, notwithstanding the disadvantages of the position, the advocates of *Ti* succeed in convincing the Directors of the Bible societies of Great Britain and America, and their Missionary Brethren in China, who now differ with them, that *Ti* is in truth the appellative name of God in Chinese, we shall all be under great obligations to them for causing the truth to triumph in spite of the great disadvantages in which it has thus been placed by the mistakes of *all foreign students* of the language. In the mean time, however, until they shew the truth of that for which they contend, they must not complain, as they themselves have mainly contributed to put matters in this position, if the difficulties of their undertaking are clearly pointed out, both to themselves and others.

We wish the reader to understand that the testimony we are now to produce in favor of *Shin*, as the appellative name of God in Chinese, is furnished by those who have always earnestly opposed the use of *Shin* to render θεός when it refers to the true God. This fact according to a well established principle of evidence, entitles this testimony, given under these circumstances, in favor of *Shin* to great weight.

The evidence of those who, as Dr. Morrison, advocated the use of *Shin* to render θεός, in all cases, might be received with caution, as that of a warm friend, who might be under prejudice in its favor; but when the evidence of those who have always opposed the use of *Shin*, for the true God, is produced in favor of its being the appellative name of God in Chinese, the fact of their opposition to such a use is our warrant to receive their testimony without hesitation. From the well known laws of our nature we feel assured that instead of this testimony being exaggerated, the almost certainty is that it has been reduced to the least possible strength consistent with the honest expression of what the parties believed to be truth.

We shall now by the way in which the word θεός has been rendered in the translations of Dr. Medhurst and Mr. Gutzlaff and in the revised copy which has been prepared at the various stations, shew that all these furnish us evidence that *Shin* is the appellative name of God in Chinese.

θεός when referring to the true God, is, as we have before said, always rendered by *Shing ti* both by Dr. Medhurst and Mr. Gutzlaff. To prove our point, we shall select a few instances in which there can be no doubt that θεός, in the original, is used as the generic name for God or for "Gods in general," as Dr. Medhurst expresses the idea, in his English and Chinese Dictionary above quoted.

The first passage, to which we shall turn, is that quoted by Waterland to illustrate the meaning of the word God, as used by polytheists, viz: Acts 14: 11. "The gods are come done to us in the likeness of men." The word "Gods" is here evidently used as the appellative name of a whole class of Beings, and the individuals, the speakers had more particularly in their minds, we learn from the next verse, were Jupiter, the supreme god of the Greeks, and Mercury, his subordinate minister, as Waterland styles him.

Dr. Medhurst translates, *Shin ming tsié jin chí ying*, 神明藉人之形 "The *Shin ming*, borrowing the likeness of men," &c. Mr. Gutzlaff renders also "*Shin ming*." The revised copy of Acts renders "Gods" by *Shin* alone:

At Acts 17: 18, we meet with this sentence, "He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange Gods." Dr. Medhurst translates, *kí nái chuen í Shin hú*, 其乃傳異神乎, "Is he not a proclaimer of strange *Shin*?" Mr. Gutzlaff renders "*strange Shin*." The Revised copy of Acts also renders "*strange Shin*."

Gal. 4: 8. "Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did ser-

vice to them which by nature are no gods." This, we suppose, may with propriety be addressed to every polytheist. Dr. Medhurst renders, *jü tang sú wí shih Sháng tí tseh fuh sz pú sáh, pan wú shin lui ché* 汝等素未識上帝則服事菩薩本無神類者, "when ye formerly knew not *Sháng tí*, then ye served *Púsáh* (the Buddhist gods), who are by nature not of the class of *Shin*."

This verse furnishes a good illustration of the necessity that exists for using the appellative name of God, for the true as well as false gods. According to the above rendering, a Chinese must infer that *Sháng tí* is of the class of *Shin*, and that he is warned against the service of the *Púsáh* (Buddhist gods) because they do not belong to the class of the *Shin*.

Historically considered, this verse, as rendered above, would puzzle him exceedingly. *Sháng tí* has been known and worshiped by the Chinese court certainly since B. C. 2200, whereas the worship of the Buddhist gods was only introduced into China in the first century of the Christian era. If we attempted a personal application of this verse to any individual, he might plead that he had constantly heard of *Sháng tí* from his infancy, that he was a Confucianist and had never served the *Púsáh* (Buddhist gods), but confined his service to the *Shin* worshiped by his own sect.

Mr. Gutzlaff renders, '*rh tang sú wí shih Sháng tí, tseh fuh sz' pan fí shin lui ché,* 爾等素未識上帝,則服事本非神類者, "When formerly ye knew not *Shang tí*, then ye worshiped those who were by nature not of the class of *Shin*."

Here the sin of the party addressed is evidently made to consist in worshipping a Being, or Beings, who did not belong to the class of Beings called *Shin*, and the inference is clear that *Sháng tí* belongs to this class.

The Revised Copy gives the same rendering as Mr. Gutzlaff. This difficulty is entirely avoided, and can only be avoided, by using the appellative name of God in both instances, e. g. "When ye knew not *Shin*, then ye worshiped those who are, by nature, not *Shin*," i. e. who falsely lay claim to what they are not.

1. Cor. 8:5,6. "For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things," &c. *Kai l'ien ti nui, sui yu to sié sin ming, yih a jin kien yu to shiu to chú, tân wú so sung, tuh yih T'ien Fú Shang tí tsau wan*

wuh ché, 蓋天地內雖有多邪神名亦依人見有多神多主但吾所崇獨一天父上帝造萬物者, "For in heaven and earth, although there are the names of many corrupt or false gods (*Shin*), and according to men's views there are many gods (*Shin*) and many lords, still he whom we worship is only one Heavenly Father, *Shang ti*, who made all things," &c. Mr. Gutzlaff's translation is the same. In the Revised copy, "many gods" is rendered many *Shin*.

There is not a single instance, that we are aware of, in either of these versions, or in the Revised version recently made at the several stations, where *Ti*, 帝, is used as the appellative name of God, and we believe that in every instance where *θεος* does not refer to the true God, it is rendered by *Shin* alone, or *Shin ming*. More than this, we have never seen a Tract, Catechism, or any other work, from the pen of any Missionary whether Protestant, or member of the Church of Rome, in which *Ti* was used as the appellative name of God; whilst from all these sources we can furnish abundant evidence of such a use of *Shin*.

Thus we see that perfect unanimity prevailed among all Protestant Missionaries in the use of *Shin*, as the appellative name of God in Chinese, until very recently, and that no one previous to the year 1847 ever thought of using *Ti* in this sense. In view of these facts, with every kind feeling towards the advocates of *Ti*, we ask them to tell us how it was that they, in common with all others, fell into this error of regarding *Shin* as the appellative name of God in Chinese; and we call upon them to justify us when we demand the very clearest proof that *Ti* is the appellative name we seek; for really we cannot do less, having a proper respect to what they themselves, in Translations, Dictionaries, and Versions of the Sacred Scriptures, have so recently taught us.

We shall now, as we promised, endeavor to answer the chief objections, to the use of *Shin* to render *θεος* into Chinese. The following are the principal that we have heard urged against this word.

1. The acts and attributes of the chief God are never predicated of *Shin*. *Shin* is never called the Lord and Governor of the world, &c. It is never used for God καὶ ἑξουχην as *θεος* was by the Greeks.
2. The class of Beings called *Shin* are inferior to the class called *Ti*.
3. The *Shin* of *Shang Ti* is spoken of: from which it is inferred that *Shin* is a mere adjunct of the Ruler.

4 *Shin* is used for the human Spirit.

5. It is urged that if *Shin* be used for God, there is great danger of being misunderstood when the God of a deceased person, or the God of any one, is spoken of.

1. The *first* of these objections is the one, we think, which weighs most with those who, although they have always used *Shin* as the appellative name of God in Chinese, yet still cannot reconcile their minds to the use of this word for the true God: on this account it claims our chief attention. This objection may be considered under two points of view:

1st, as an argument against *Shin* as the generic name of God in Chinese.

2dly, admitting that it is the generic name of God, the fact, that *Shin* has never been used by the Chinese for God κατ' ἐξοχήν, may be urged as an argument against our use of this word for the true God. We shall consider it under both these points of view.

This objection, viewed as an argument against *Shin* as the generic name of God, may be thus stated. There are many things predicated of the chief god of the Chinese, which are never predicated of *Shin*, therefore *Shin* cannot be the generic name of God in Chinese. This arrangement is entirely based on the following incorrect proposition: "Whatsoever may be predicated of any individual of a genus, may be predicated of the whole class." But who will maintain that, because a Lion belongs to the class of quadrupeds, therefore whatever may be predicated of a Lion, may be predicated of the whole class; and so of the genus *homo*: that whatever may be predicated of a Newton, a Napoleon, or a Howard may be predicated of the genus *homo*. Or, to reverse the argument, who would maintain that because there are many things said of Lions that are never predicated of the genus quadruped, therefore the Lion does not belong to this genus? We have proved, by the direct and positive testimony of Chinese writers, that the chief god of the Chinese is a *Shin*, that he is regarded as the most honorable individual of this class of Beings; and it is surely in vain, in the absence of all direct counter testimony, to endeavor to set aside this positive testimony by such an influence as the one above stated.

This objection, considered in the *second* point of view stated above, may be thus expressed. "It is true the great mass of the Greeks were polytheists, and θεός was used by them as the generic name of God; but besides this use of θεός for a god, any god, there were a few philosophers and some poets, who used this word to designate a

single Being, whom they regarded as the Framer and Governor of the world. *Shin*, however, is never used for God καὶ ἔξοχόν; therefore we must not use it in this way, we must not employ it to designate the true God.

θεός and *Shin* are used to designate the highest class of Beings worshiped by the Greeks and Chinese respectively. In this the two words are precisely alike. The difference between them arises from this, that some of the Greek philosophers, seeing the folly of the old Theogonies and of the popular polytheism, used the generic name given by their countrymen to the highest class of Beings they worshiped to designate a single Being, who was by them styled θεός, καὶ ἔξοχόν. This was a step taken in the right direction; an advance towards the monotheism taught in the Sacred Scriptures: no such step has been taken in China; the generic name given to the highest class of Beings, worshiped there, is not, by Chinese writers, used for God καὶ ἔξοχόν, and therefore it is concluded that *Shin* should not be so used by us. To this conclusion we demur, and contend, on the contrary, that we must do for the Chinese word *Shin* what the Greek philosophers commenced to do for θεός and what the apostles completed, viz; make it, by our usage, designate, not any one of a class to be determined by the context, but the God καὶ ἔξοχόν. We contend that we must teach the Chinese to use the generic name of God which their language furnishes, in this manner, as soon as possible, and by all means available, as the only method of teaching them monotheism and leading them off from the worship of many Gods.

The facts, stated above, show that we meet *Shin* just where the Greek philosophers found θεός; designating any one of a class of Beings who are all regarded as proper objects of worship. The fact that the Greek philosophers used the appellative name of God which their language furnished them to designate a Supreme Being, καὶ ἔξοχόν, so far from being an argument against a similar use of *Shin*, the appellative name of God in Chinese, is a direct argument in favor of such use.

It appears, however, to be a favorite argument, with those who oppose the use of *Shin*, to maintain, that, because the Chinese themselves have not predicated of *Shin* (the name of the highest class of Beings to whom they offer religious worship) the creation, preservation and government of the world, therefore we must not predicate these things of *Shin*. They have gone so far as to say, that it would be against "the idiom of the Chinese language," to predicate the go-

vernment of the world of *Shin*. We cannot see how "the idiom of a language" can interfere with our predicating any thing that agrees with truth and right reason of any subject; and if the position is maintained that it is improper and contrary to the "idiom of the Chinese language," to predicate any thing *of a subject*, which the Chinese themselves have never predicated *of it*, the attempt to make them acquainted with the character and attributes of the true God is hopeless; indeed, we cannot enlarge their knowledge of any subject. But surely no people can possess a language having so peculiar "an idiom;" we therefore need not dwell any longer on this objection.

2. The second objection is that the class of Beings called *Shin* are inferior, to the class called *Ti*.

In the previous part of this paper we have shown that *Shin* is the name given to the highest of the three classes, into which the Chinese divide the invisible Beings, who are the objects of their worship. In the sequel we shall show that *Ti* is not the name of any class of Beings, but is a *Title* by which either *Shin* or men may be distinguished.

3. The third objection is that the phrases *Ti chi Shin*, 帝之神, and *Ti Shin*, 帝神, "The *Shin* of *Ti*," are occasionally met with; and an inference is drawn from this fact, that *Shin* is nothing more than an *adjunct* of *Ti*, the Ruler. It is admitted by all that the word *Shin* is used, in this instance, in an abstract sense, though there is diversity of opinion as to the exact idea conveyed by the term in the phrases above quoted. These phrases occur in describing the way in which Heaven, *Sháng Ti* or any other Being worshiped, approaches and enjoys the sacrifices made to them. This presence is not supposed to be corporeal or essential; they therefore do not say that the Being himself is present, but that his *Shin* is present. To express their belief in this presence, they profess to escort the *Shin* of the Being worshiped to the shrine at the commencement of the sacrifice, and to attend it on its exit, the sacrifice being ended. They suppose that sincerity on the part of the worshiper is necessary to secure this presence, and maintain that when this sincerity is wanting, there is *nothing* present at the time of sacrifice. We suppose the Chinese mean by the use of the word *Shin* in these cases, to express the idea that the Being worshiped is present by a divine energy or influence. The advocates of *Ti* maintain that *Shin*, in these cases, means spiritual energy." The ideas do not differ much; and whichever of these opinions be correct, such a use of *Shin*, is

the *abstract sense*, is no argument against our use of the term in the *concrete sense*, as the appellative name of God; as this is the sense in which the word occurs much the most frequently in Chinese writers. We have an instance of a word being applied to this double use viz: to express a quality and a Being also, in the word "Divinity." We speak of Christ's Divinity. We say that, although personally present in heaven, he is by his Divinity (divine influence or energy?) present everywhere: and yet we speak of God as "the Divinity."

4. The fourth objection to the use of *Shin* is that the human spirit is sometimes designated by this term. That such a use of *Shin* is met with, especially in medical books, cannot be denied. It is however not in common use among the people. It has grown out of the pantheism of one class of the Chinese philosophers, and we suppose has been taken from them by the medical writers. It amounts, we think, to nothing more than the phrase "the divinity that stirs within us," sometimes used by western writers for the soul. Our use of *Shin* to render *θεος*, whether referring to the true, or a false God, can never, in any instance, be misunderstood from the existence of this limited use of the word *Shin* to designate the human soul, by the writers we have mentioned above.

5. The fifth objection is that if, *Shin* is used for God, there is great danger of being misunderstood when the God of a deceased parent, or the God of any one, is spoken of.

As there can be no doubt that *Shin* is often used for the manes of the dead, who are regarded by the Chinese as proper objects of religious worship, this objection has much weight, if we translate literally "The *Shin* of," e. g. "Abraham." In such a case, if we translated "the *Shin* of Abraham" we admit there would be much danger, until the Christian usage of the word shall have taught them better, that the Chinese would understand by this phrase, the manes of Abraham. But we are by no means tied down to the use of the genitive in such cases, if its use endangers so serious a misunderstanding. All danger of mistake may be removed by translating "the *Shin* who protected Abraham, Isaac, &c." "The God of our Fathers," may be rendered either "the *Shin* who protected our Fathers," or "the *Shin* whom our Fathers worshiped," as either of these ideas may be considered most prominently presented by the context. This course has been adopted by those who used *Shang tí* for God. Acts 5:30. "The God of our Fathers raised up Jesus," is thus rendered by Dr. Medhurst: *wú tsú so fung chí Sháng tí, í sú Yé sú,*

吾祖所奉之上帝，已甦耶穌，"The *Shang ti* whom our Fathers worshiped has raised up Jesus." Such a rendering, in case *Shin* were used, would remove all danger of misunderstanding.

With this brief consideration of the objections that are urged against the use of *Shin*, we conclude the part of our Essay which relates to this word.

We shall now state the reasons that forbid us to employ *Ti*, 帝 to render *Elohim* and θεός.

The chief reason is that *Ti* is not the appellative name of God in Chinese: it is not the name of any class of Beings, human or divine, but is a *title* which has been given by the Chinese, from the highest antiquity to the present time, to individuals of the human species as well as to invisible beings, the objects of religious worship.

The negative evidence against *Ti* being the appellative name of God, produced when we were considering *Shin*, was so strong and conclusive that the Reader will not be detained long with the discussion of this term.

In the explanation of its meaning, native dictionaries and those prepared by foreigners agree so entirely that we shall not find it necessary to appeal to Chinese writers to ascertain its *usus loquendi*.

1. The first work we shall quote is the Dictionary called *Shwoh Wan*, 說文, prepared by *Hü Shin* 許慎, a scholar of the Hân dynasty; a work of much authority. The word *Ti* is defined as follows.

1st. *Ti*, *ti yè* 帝, 諦也; "Tí means a Judge." 2d. *Wáng t'ien hiá chí háu*, 王天下之號, "The style or title of him who rules over the empire."

The Reader is requested to observe that *Ti* is not here defined as a posthumous title, but as a title given to him who *rules over the Empire*. The word "Judge," in the first definition, we suppose is used in the sense of the final arbiter of all causes, in which sense it is synonymous with King, Emperor, or Ruler, according to the phrase which may be used in any commonwealth to designate the highest power. These are all the definitions given by this Dictionary, and there are no passages, cited to illustrate its use. It is therefore most certain that the author of this work could not have had any idea that *Ti* was the common appellative name of God in Chinese.

2. We quote next the Dictionary called *Luh Shü Kú*, 六書

君, made by *Tai Tung*, 戴侗, a scholar of the *Sung* dynasty, which gives:

Ti, chü tsai chí tsun ching, kú t'ien yueh Sháng ti; wú k'í yueh wú ti; t'ien tsz', yueh ti, 帝王宰之尊稱故天曰上帝五氣曰五帝天子曰帝, Ti is the honorable designation of a sovereign Ruler, therefore, Heaven is called Sháng Ti (the Ruler on high;) (the Shin who preside over) the five elements are called Wú Ti (the five Rulers), and the son of Heaven is called Ti, Ruler or Emperor."

Here it is quite plain that the author of this Dictionary regarded *Ti* as a title, and not as the appellative name of a class of Beings. It designates, according to him, a sovereign Ruler; whether that Ruler be a man governing his fellow men, a *Shin* presiding over one of the five elements, or Heaven presiding over all things. We have translated all the meanings given by this Dictionary. There are no passages cited to illustrate its use.

3. We cite next the great Imperial Dictionary prepared by order of the emperor *Kángih*.

In this work we have three meanings given: 1st. *Ti, tí yé, 帝諦也*, "*Ti*, means a judge;" 2d. *Wang t'ien hiá chüan, 王天下之號*, "The style or title of him who rules over the Empire." These two meanings are the same as those given in the *Shwuh Wan*, the first Dictionary cited; and they are mentioned as quoted from that work. 3d. *Kün, 君*, "A prince."

Then follow a number of quotations, from various classical works, to illustrate these meanings. In these extracts we have, at a single view, all the facts upon which the advocates of *Ti* rest their argument in favor of *Ti*, as the appellative name of God; we shall, therefore, cite all the passages they regard as important, and give a translation, calling the Reader's attention to the points where our translation differs from theirs.

The first quotation is from a work called *Peh-kü Tung, 白虎通*, as follows:

Teh hoh t'ien che ching ti, 德合天者稱帝, "He whose (*teh**) power corresponds to that of Heaven is designated a *Ti*, Ru-

* We have translated the word *teh*, 德, "power," and not "virtue," as this latter word, being generally used for a moral quality, would mislead the English reader. *Teh* means "power," influence, &c., whether well or ill directed. Dr. Morrison defines it "Virtue, (virtus) commonly in a good sense. power, force, abundance." Dr. Medhurst defines it, "Virtue.

ler or Emperor," i. e. He who rules over the whole empire, which is styled by Chinese maguiloquence *t'ien hiá* 天下 "all under the Heavens," as Heaven rules over all things that are under it, is styled *Ti*, Ruler or Emperor.

The next quotation is from the *Shü King*, and is as follows:

Sih tsai ti Yáu, tsung ming wan sz' kwáng tseh t'ien hiá 昔在帝堯聰明文思光宅天下, "Formerly the Emperor Yáu (*Ti* 帝 Yáu,) was intelligent, accomplished, and thoughtful, and his glory pervaded all under Heaven, or the Empire."

On the title *Ti* (Emperor) given to Yáu we have the following observations quoted from a commentator:

Ti ché t'ien chí yih ming: so i ming tí, tí ché, tí yé, y'n t'ien táng jen wú sio, wáng yü muh wo, kung ping t'ung yuen kü sz' shín tí; kú wí ch'í tí yé. Wú tí t'au t'ung yü sz' yih nang shín tí, kí t'sü kí ming, 帝者天之一名所以名帝帝者諱也言天蕩然無心忘於物我公平通遠舉事審諱故謂之帝也五帝道同於此亦能審諱故取其名, "Ti is one of the titles (*ming* 名) of Heaven; the reason that it (*Heaven*) has this title (*ming*) is that *Ti* means a Judge. The meaning is that Heaven extensively, without mental effort, equitably and thoroughly examines and judges all affairs; therefore it (*Heaven*) is called *Ti*, a judge. The principles of the *Wu Ti* (five ancient Emperors) being the same with those above mentioned, they were also able to examine and judge; therefore they took this title (*ming*) i. e. *Ti*, Judge, or Emperor."

Whether the word *ming*, 名, in this and several subsequent quotations should be translated, "title," or "name," is disputed, and is a matter of much importance; but we reserve the discussion of this point until all the cases in which the word "*ming*" occurs are before us.

We have next, in *Kánglí's Dictionary* a quotation from a writer in the *Ch'un Ts'ü*, 春秋, in which the titles *Ti*, 帝 Emperor and *Wáng*, 王, "a king," are distinguished as follows.

"A *Ti*, Emperor, is one with whom *t'ien hiá*, 天下, "all under goodness, excellence, influence, vigor, energy;" &c., &c., and quotes, as an instance of the use of the word, *ngoh teh*, 惡德, "bad qualities;" from which it is plain, as we have said above, that the meaning is more general than that of our English word "virtue."

the Heavens (i. e. the whole Empire) accords. A *Wáng*, King, is one to whom the whole Empire goes (for redress)."

These two titles are thus distinguished by another writer: "He who examines into principles is styled *Ti*, Emperor; and he who thoroughly investigates (*teh* 德) the powers or capacities of things, is called *Wáng*, a king."

These are probably fanciful distinctions which have no existence except in the minds of the writers; but these sentences serve to shew that *Ti*, like *Wáng*, "King," is a title and not the appellative name of a class of Beings.

We have next a quotation from a historical work containing the records of the reign of *Káu Ti*, 高 帝, saying that he ascended the throne of the *Hwáng Ti*, 皇 帝, "August Ruler," or Emperor, on the south of the river Sze." Upon this title, *Hwáng Ti*, a writer, *Tsai Yung*, remarks, "that in the highest antiquity the son of Heaven (i. e. the Emperor) was styled *Hwáng*, "Augustus," but afterwards he was styled, *Ti*, "Ruler or Emperor."

Here we perceive *Ti*, as well as *Hwáng*, was a title given to the son of Heaven without reference to any thing but his station. We shall see afterwards that the title *Ti* is considered inferior to *Hwáng*.*

Next we are told that *Ti* is used as a posthumous title, and the meaning when so used is explained as follows.

* Much obscurity rests upon the earliest period of Chinese history which is allotted by their historians to the three *Hwáng*, 三 皇, and the five *Ti*, 五 帝: Under the first period, Dr. Morrison, in his "View of China for Philological purposes," gives the names of the following individuals as having reigned. 1. *Fuh-i* 伏羲; 2. *Shin nung*, 神 農; 3. *Ti lin hwei*, 帝 臨 魁; 4. *Ti ching*, 帝 承; 5. *Ti Ming* 帝 明; 6. *Ti i*, 帝 宜; 7. *Ti lái* 帝 來; 8. *Ti Li*, 帝 裏; 9. *Ti yü wáng*, 帝 榆 罔; 10. *Hwáng ti*, 黃 帝. He then gives the names of the Five Emperors *Wü Ti*, 五 帝, as follows: "Shaou haou, Chuen Kuh, Te Kwuh, Te Yaou, and Te Shun." Shun's reign closed B. C. 2169. Under date of B. C. 2330, the Dr. says, "A prince is here placed by some, who was called *Ti che*, 帝 摯; and of whom it is said that he proceeded to unlimited dissipation." This seems quite inconsistent with the idea that *Ti*, in the olden time, was not a mere title conferred on any one who might sit on the Imperial throne, but a word implying moral qualities of the highest order, and hence conferred as an epithet of distinction, on five Emperors because of their preëminent virtue. During the *Hsia*, *Shang* and *Chou* dynasties, the

"He whose (*tch*) power or influence is like that of Heaven and earth is called *Ti*."

We have next the phrase *Sháng Tí* 上帝, explained as follows: "*Sháng Tí* (the Ruler on High) is Heaven."

Then are quoted two sentences from the classics to illustrate the use of *Sháng Tí*, as a title given to the chief object of worship.

Next we have the phrase, *Wú tí*, 五帝, "five Rulers," explained as follows: *Wú tí Shin ming* 五帝神名, "Five Rulers is the title (*ming* 名) of gods (*Shin*)."

A sentence is then quoted from the *Chau Li*, "Ritual of the *Chau* dynasty," in which this phrase "Five Rulers," occurs; it is as follows: "They sacrificed to the *Wú tí*, Five Rulers, "at the borders of the country." The names of these "Five Rulers," are then given from a Commentator as follows: "He who is styled *Tsáng Tí*, 蒼帝, the "azure Ruler" is named *Ling wei gáng*; the *Chih Tí*, 赤帝, "Vermilion Ruler," is named *Ceih péau nú*, the *Hwáng Tí* 黃帝, "Yellow Ruler," is named, *Shie kiu niú*; the *Peh Tí* 白帝 "White Ruler." *Peh Chau Kiu*, the *Heh Tí*, 黑帝, "Black Ruler," is named *Hie Kwáng kí*.

We are next informed by a quotation from a work styled "The family sayings of Confucius," which of the numerous *Shin* in the Chinese Pantheon are distinguished collectively by the title of "Five Rulers," and individually by the titles "azure Ruler," "Vermilion Ruler," &c., &c. "The disciple *Hi Káng tsz'* asked an explanation of the title (*ming* 名) *Wú Tí*, "Five Rulers;" Confucius replied, heaven has five elements, viz: metal, wood, water fire, and earth, which divide the seasons (i. e. each rule a part of the year), and which transform things and nourish them, in order to complete

titles *Hwáng* 皇, and *Tí* 帝, both fell into disuse. After a time of great anarchy, the country having been divided into seven petty states, the prince of the *Tsin* country prevailed over the other six states, and made himself monarch of China. He combined the two ancient titles *Hwáng* "Augustus," and *Tí* "Ruler," making the title *Hwáng Tí*, "August Ruler," or Emperor, which has been used as the common title of the Emperors of China from his time, B. C. 204, to the present. This being the state of the case, should we adopt the word *Tí*, as that by which to render θεός in the Scriptures, and use this word for God in all our preaching, we must either declare war against the Emperor's title which has two thousand years prescription in its favor, and forbid all Christians to call him by this title, or we must call a man "August God," than which, it would be better for us to cut out our tongues.

all things; the gods (*Shin*) of these elements (i. e. the gods who preside over these elements) are styled *Wa Ti* "The Five Rulers."

This completes all the quotations in *Kángli's* Dictionary that are of any interest in our present inquiry.

In the facts above presented, the advocates of *Ti* think there is proof that *Ti* is the appellative name of God in Chinese. *Ti*, say they, is one of the names (*ming*) of T'ien, "the Divinity;" it is also the name (*ming* 名) of the five *Shin*, who preside over the five elements, who are unquestionably regarded as Gods by the Chinese. This is the main argument adduced by the advocates of *Ti* to prove that it is the appellative name of God in Chinese; and they lay much stress upon the fact that it is the Imperial Dictionary that sustains their views.

Let us then carefully examine the facts presented above. It is admitted that we have presented to us in the above extracts, all the invisible Beings who were by the ancient Chinese called *Ti*. These Beings are six in number. 1. *T'ien*, Heaven, which is styled *Ti* or *Sháng Ti*. 2. The five *Shin*, who preside over the five elements, collectively are called *Wu Ti*, and individually "azure *Ti*," vermilion *Ti*, &c. To these must be added five men, who, in high antiquity, ruled over the Chinese nation. The question on which we are at issue is, whether the word *Ti*, when applied to these eleven individuals,—six of them *Shin*, and five mortal men, is used as an appellative name, designating a distinct *genus*, who are to be regarded as gods, or is a title by which individuals belonging to different *genera* are distinguished. We maintain the latter opinion; the advocates of *Ti* the former, and insist on the fact that *Ti* is said to be the "*Ming*" of these eleven individuals as proof of their position, maintaining that this word, "*ming*," must be translated *name*. That the word *ming* is used for either a name or a title is known to every one acquainted with the Chinese language, the only question is, in which of these senses it is used in this case; which of the meanings does the context call for?

Dr. Morrison defines *ming* "a name, a title," &c. Dr. Medhurst "a name, a title, a designation," &c.

That the word *ming* is used for a title appears clearly from the following quotation *Hwáng Yü 'rh nien Sun Shih yen, T'ien wei yih shin, í k'í chí tsun, kú yü to ming, yih yü jia kinu, ching wáng hwáng, hau p'ih P'ien wáng, P'ien tsz', hwáng tí, 皇祐二年孫奭言天惟一神以其至尊故有多名亦猶人*

君稱王皇后辟天王天子皇帝 (The *Chang P'ien* 長編, quoted in the *Yuen Kieu Lui Han*, 淵鑑類函) "In the second year of the Emperor Hwáng-Yü, Sim Shih said, Heaven only is one God, (一神 *yih shiu*,) but because he is most honorable, we give him many "ming" titles; as in the case of a human Prince, we call him *Wáng*, King; *Hwáng*; Augustus; *Han King P'ih*, His Majesty; *T'ien Wáng*, celestial King, *T'ien tsz'* the Son of Heaven, and *Hwáng Ti* the august Ruler, or Emperor."^{*}

It will be perceived that all the words and phrases that are cited as instances of the various "ming," that are given to a human prince are titles, and not one can be regarded as a name, using this last word in a strict sense. It is plain then that the word "ming" may be translated either name or title, as suits best with the context and subject matter before us. If it be maintained that *Ti* is the "ming," name of Heaven, of the five *Shin*, and of the five men who ruled over the Empire, it must be either a proper name given to each, or an appellative name common to all. The idea of its being a proper name is out of the question, and is not maintained by our opponents. Let us then, to avoid ambiguity, define what we mean by an appellative name, and then inquire whether the word *Ti* is used by the authors of *K'anghi's Dictionary* as the appellative name of these eleven individuals, or as a title common to them all.

De Sacy, in his general Grammar, defines appellative nouns as follows; "Other nouns designate beings by the idea of a *nature common to all the individuals of a species*. Such are the words, "man," "horse," "cat," &c., &c., which do not of themselves call to mind the idea of any individual in particular, but are applicable to all the individuals of the same species." These nouns, *applicable to all the individuals of a species*, are called appellative nouns."

To our minds it is clear that the word *Ti* is not used in the sentences quoted in *K'anghi*, as the appellative name of a class of Beings, for the following reasons: 1. It is defined by the Lexicographers themselves as a title; i. e. Judge, Ruler, Prince. 2. *Ming* in the last clause of the sentence quoted from the commentary on the *Shü King*, "therefore they (the five Emperors) took this *ming*," we know from history must mean title and not name, because neither of

* This remark of *Sim Shih* is the nearest approach to monotheism we have met with in any Chinese writer, attention is particularly called to the fact that he uses the phrase *Yih Shin* 一神, "one God," to express this idea.

these Emperors was named *Ti*; the *ming* in the first clause, *Ti* is one of the *ming* of Heaven," and must therefore mean title also, since the writer cannot have used the word *ming* in different senses, as the reason, assigned why Heaven and the *Wú Tí* respectively, had this *ming*, is the same. 3. The reason assigned why Heaven and the five ancient sovereigns had this title (*ming*) in common, is not that they belonged to the same class of Beings, but that *Ti* means a "Judge," and that both Heaven and the five sovereigns were able to judge just judgment. The Reader will not forget that the title *Tí* was not given to these five sovereigns after death, when they had become the objects of religious worship, but was the title by which they were commonly known while living, when no one ever thought of offering them religious worship, or esteemed them as belonging to a different species from their fellow-men. 4. That the word *Tí*, when applied to the five *Shin*, who preside over the five elements, is used as a title and not as an appellative name is equally plain. We have the class of Beings designated by the word *Shin*, we have the proper name of each of these *Shin* given, "*Ling wei gung*," &c., the separate title of each, e. g. "Azure *Tí*, Yellow *Tí*, &c., and lastly, the title of the five collectively, *Wú Tí*, "Five Rulers."

The facts presented in this Dictionary are those upon which the advocates of *Tí* as we have said above, rest their cause; if we are correct in translating the word "*ming*," title, then the very foundation of their cause is taken away, and the whole superstructure falls to the ground. They regard this Imperial Dictionary, they tell us, as the best authority extant for giving the meaning of Chinese words. We are perfectly willing to abide by their appeal in this case, and say cheerfully, let *Tí* be regarded as these Lexicographers have represented it.

We find in *Kánghí's* Dictionary nothing to countenance the idea that *Tí* is the appellative name of God, or to sustain the opinion that it is the generic name of any class of Beings: but the clearest proof, on the contrary, that it is a title, conferred on either *Shin* (gods) or men. It is precisely like our word "*King*," by which title we may either address the King of kings or a fellow worm of the dust.

Before dismissing the Imperial Dictionary we will call the Reader's attention to one more fact. Among the uses of the word *Tí*, we find it is used as a posthumous title. Knowing that the word *Shin* was also used as a posthumous title, and that the Chinese attach great importance to the posthumous titles that are conferred upon

then deceased great men, we were induced to turn to the *Sz' Kt*, *Ching* 1, the work quoted in *Kanghi* as authority on this point, to see which of the two words, *Shin*, or *Ti*, conveyed the highest idea of that which was to be esteemed and venerated. The Chinese have a regular system—a gradation of merit, by which these titles are said to be conferred; we felt assured therefore, that in this table of posthumous titles, if any where, we should find the relative value of words accurately pointed out. Upon turning to the table given in the *Sz' Kt*, we find that *Shin* 神, is the first and highest title, that *Hwang* 皇, is the second, and that *Ti* 帝, ranks third. This furnishes us with a very strong presumption against *Ti* meaning God *καὶ ἐξοχῆν*, as those maintain who favor its use to render *θεός*.

4. The encyclopedia called *Pei wan Yun fu* 佩文韻府, gives three meanings. 1st. 帝, 諦也, “*Ti*, means a Judge.” 2d. 王天下之號, “the style or title of him who rules over the empire.” 3d. *Kim* 君, “a prince.” These meanings are the same as those given in *Kanghi's* Dictionary, and the same works are quoted to sustain them, viz.: the *Shwoh Wān* and the *Urh Ya*.

We next turn to the Dictionaries which have been prepared by foreigners.

5. Dr. Morrison defines the meaning of *Ti* as follows. “The appellation of one who judges the world; or of one who rules over the nations: an epithet of respect and honor applied to one who rules as a lord or sovereign; an emperor; an independent monarch, celestial virtue. *Wu Ti*, 五帝, five ancient emperors; also the God of Heaven, and the gods of seasons. The name of a star; the name of a place. *Hwang, Ti, Wang*, 皇, 帝, 王, according to some, express the three degrees of sovereign rule, of which *Hwang* is the highest, *Ti* the second, and *Wang* the lowest. *Hwang Ti* is a common appellation of the emperor of China. *Shang Ti*, 上帝, the Highest Sovereign, the Supreme Ruler; Heaven, or *T'ien chi Shin*, 天之神, the God of heaven; or, according to others, all the gods of heaven collectively; *Ti wang*, 帝王, a sovereign potentate.” These are all the meanings and illustrations given by the Doctor, from which it is plain he regarded *Ti* as a title, and not as an appellative name of any class of Beings.

6. Dr. Medhurst's *Hok Keen* Dictionary: “*Tay* 帝, an emperor, a ruler, a sovereign. *Hwang Te* 皇帝, the emperor. *Te wei* 帝位, the emperor's throne. *San Hwang Woo Te*, 三皇五帝,

the three sovereigns and five emperors, a very early period of Chinese history."

Here the word is treated throughout as a title and no intimation is given of its being a generic name.

Dr. Medhurst's Chinese and English Dictionary: "*Ti* 帝 an Emperor, a Sovereign, a Ruler, the Supreme. *Hwáng tí* 皇帝 an Emperor, *Sháng tí* 上帝 the Supreme Ruler, *Wú Tí* 五帝 the five ancient Emperors. *Ti wáng* 帝王 a Sovereign Prince. *T'ien tí* 天帝 the Ruler of Heaven."

Here again we have the same thing stated. *Ti* (*Te*) is treated throughout as a title, and not the slightest intimation is given that it is ever used as the appellative name of any class of Beings.

If there is any faith to be placed in these Dictionaries, made by eminent native and foreign scholars, the matter is clear beyond all reasonable ground of doubt, that *Ti* is not the appellative name of God in Chinese. There is no difference of opinion here to be settled by an appeal to the *usus loquendi* of this word in the works of good writers; but all, with one voice, tell us that *Ti* is a title, that it is a relative term and therefore cannot be the appellative name of God in Chinese.

To the objection that *Ti* is a title and means Ruler, in all cases, and not God, its advocates reply as follows. It is not merely the government of all things that is predicated of *Ti*, but *Ti* is said "to produce all things,"* "to confer the virtuous nature on the people,"

* This phrase, "to produce all things," unexplained, would mislead those unacquainted with the Phraseology used in Chinese cosmogony. The Chinese phrase is *sang wán wù* 生萬物, "to engender, or beget all things," which does not refer to the original creation of matter, but, as the phrase "engender" would lead us to suspect, the begetting of all things around us by the primordial substance, which, in the view of Chinese Cosmogonists, is eternal. This *sang wán wù* 生萬物, "begetting of all things," is ascribed to Heaven, to Heaven and Earth, to the five elements, to the *yin* and *yang*, and occasionally to *Ti*, or *Shàng tí*. This production of all things, is however only ascribed to *Ti* by modern writers; for as we have learned from M. Visdelou in a former part of this Essay, this title, according to the view of the modern Doctors, was given by Confucius and the ancient writers to the primitive Reason. (a name these writers give to *T'ien* the chief Divinity) only when it is said to act in the government of the world. His words are, "comme Confucius dans le livre canonique des changements a fait plus d'une fois mention du *Chang tí*, c'est-à-dire du suprême Empereur et du *Ti* c'est-à-dire de l'EMPEREUR, et que cependant on ne voit nulle part dans ce livre, ni dans les autres que le *Chang tí* ait engendré la matière, c'est-à-dire, le ciel et la terre; les philosophes concluent delà que LE TITRE DE *CHANG TI* ne peut convenir à la raison primitive, que quand il s'agit seulement du gouvernement de l'univers."

&c., &c., which acts are not properly predicated of a Ruler, but of God: therefore *Ti* must in these cases be rendered "God," and not "the Ruler." In answer to this we remark, that in the passages mentioned above, and in all similar passages, it is admitted by all that the Being referred to is *T'ien*, of whom these things are repeatedly predicated in the ancient Canonical Books.—It being then the Chief God of whom these acts are predicated, it is indifferent whether this chief God, the subject of discourse, be pointed out by the use of his title, or his name. Nothing is more common than the use of a title, for such a purpose; if then, in any case, the title and not the name is used to designate this individual, when the act said to be performed is not done in virtue of the authority implied by said title, we are not therefore to infer that the writer uses this title in some unusual sense not sustained by the common usage of the word, but suppose rather that he merely uses it to designate the particular individual whose well known designation it is; and the individual, who is the subject of the discourse, being thus pointed out, he proceeds to mention some act of his without any reference to the manner in which the subject of the discourse was designated. We have a familiar instance of this use of a title to designate an individual, when we are about to affirm something concerning him that has not the slightest connexion with the meaning of the title used, in the following sentences. "The King dined at Windsor," "The King is dead," &c., where no one would contend that anything more was designed by the use of the title King than to designate a particular individual as the subject of discourse. The use of the title *Ti*, to designate *T'ien*, the chief God of Chinese in the instances quoted by the advocates of *Te*, is entirely analogous.

It being shown, on the authority of all the Dictionaries, that *Ti* is a relative term, denoting office, and not an appellative noun, a serious objection to this word *θεος*, may be founded on its unsuitableness to express the doctrine of the Trinity. We are taught in Scripture, that the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity sustain distinct offices in the economy of Redemption, and yet that they are but one in essence, or consubstantial. To express this doctrine we say, "the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God; and these three Persons are one God." To designate the different Offices they sustain, we say,—"The Father is the Creator, the Son is the Redeemer, and the Holy Ghost is the Sanctifier." Now suppose we were to render "The Father is Ruler, the Son is Ruler, and the Holy Ghost is Ruler, and these three Persons are one Ruler:" there

would be no unity of substance, or *even of nature* implied by the use of the word *Ti*; for, as we have seen, it is used as the title of living men, as well as of *Shin* (gods)—beings belonging to entirely different species. And this word *Ti*, denoting as it does, a definite office, would, if used as above, clash with the statement of the three distinct offices sustained by the several Persons of the Blessed Trinity. From this difficulty we can see no way of escape, if we use *Ti* to render θεός.

That *Ti* is not the appellative name of God in Chinese, appears also from the following facts. In the classical works of the Confucianists, from which we learn who are the objects of worship in the state religion, this epithet, which is constantly used as the title of the five emperors, is only applied to six Beings, (as we have said above,) who were the objects of religious worship, viz.: “to *T'ien*, Heaven, or the *T'ien chí Shin*, 天之神, “*Shin* (God) of Heaven,” who is styled *Shángti*, and to *Shin* who preside over the five elements, who are called *Wá Ti*. Each of these six individuals, so distinguished by the title of *Ti*, Ruler, we have seen, belong to the class of Beings called *Shin*. *Ti* therefore is not a generic term, denoting a distinct class of Beings; but a relative term, marking relationship. *Neither of these invisible Beings, distinguished by the title of Ti, have ever been worshiped by the people of China;* but the worship of them has always been confined to the emperor, and the people have been forbidden by severe penalties to worship them.

The worship of the “Five Rulers” was discontinued by the *Ming* dynasty, A. D. 1369, and has never since been resumed. So that the title *Ti* is applied to only one Being who, is now an object of worship in the state religion, viz.: *T'ien*, and this being is not worshiped by any of the people of China, but only by the emperor, the honor of worshipping the *Sháng tí*, “Ruler on High,” being reserved exclusively to the *Hwáng tí*, “August Ruler,” on earth.

How can it be maintained that such a term is the appellative name of God?

The agreement of all the Dictionaries is so entire in representing *Ti* as a title, and the inferences derived from this fact are so conclusive against its use, that it appears to us it would be a work of supererogation to write any thing more against *Ti*, as the appellative name of God in Chinese. We shall therefore content ourselves with illustrating the impropriety of using this word to render *Elohim*, by testing it on the first commandment, e. g. *Ti yueh, chú wo*

wài, 'rh puh k'ò yù pich tí yé, 帝曰除我外爾不可有別帝也.

Before translating this, please read again the meanings of *Ti* given by the *Shwoh Wán*, "The title of him who rules over the Empire," and that of the *Luh Shú Kú*, "The honorable designation of a Sovereign Ruler," and say whether by so rendering this commandment, we should not be guilty of propagating, in the name of God, a precept the most disorganizing and subversive of civil government that was ever propounded. "The Ruler says, besides me thou shalt have no other Ruler." What does this say but that *He who is "the Ruler," par excellence* forbids men to sustain the relationship of "*the ruler*" towards any other Being than himself. If this is the meaning of the Commandment, civil government is rebellion against God. That this commandment, rendered into Chinese as above, would be open to this construction, cannot be denied, for the word *Ti*, 帝, as it is found in Chinese books, refers to the man who is, or has been, at the head of the Chinese government, at least a hundred times to where it refers to any invisible being once. This single consideration we think conclusive against the use of this word.

But in answer to this it is said, the Jewish Kings and Judges are sometimes called *Elohim*, and that therefore the Emperor's being called *Ti* is no valid argument against the use of this word to render *Elohim* and θεός. To this we reply, the cases are by no means similar. We know it is common to say that the Jewish Judges and Kings are called *Elohim*, but we prefer much the view that Hengstinberg takes of this use of *Elohim* in the first volume of his *Christology*, when treating of the 45th Psalm. He contends that, no Theocratic Prince or Conqueror is ever called *Elohim*, in the Scriptures and says, "Nowhere is any single magistrate called *Elohim*, but always only the magistracy as such, representing the tribunal of God."

If this opinion of Hengstinberg is correct, this use of *Elohim* in Hebrew is not at all like that of *Ti* in Chinese, since *Ti* is used in the classics as the common title of *Yáu* and *Shun* and of other Emperors. But even if *Elohim* is occasionally used for individual Kings and Judges, as the advocates of *Ti* contend, still the cases are by no means similar. If *Elohim* had been the common title by which the Jewish Kings or Judges were known, e. g. "God David," "God Solomon," as in Chinese they say *Ti Yáu*, *Ti Shun*, then the use of *Elohim* in the old Testament would be a case in point. But we all know that *Elohim* is not the common title of any Jewish officer ;

and that *Elohim*, when used for the magistracy, is employed not strictly but figuratively. We are correct in regarding the word as used only figuratively in these cases, because it is comparatively so used but a few times, and we are distinctly told there is but one *Elohim* strictly speaking.

But this cannot be said of *Ti*. It is the title by which the highest officer in China has been commonly designated for hundreds of years. It occurs in Chinese books, as the title of this officer, a hundred or a thousand times, to once where it occurs as the title of any invisible Being. To attempt therefore to prove, from the fact that a few invisible Beings are called *Ti*, that it means God as *Elohim* does, is to maintain that a word is used *improperly* much more frequently than *properly*, which upsets all our ideas of the proper meaning of words. There can be no doubt that *T'aukwáng* is regarded by the Chinese to be as properly a *Ti* as *Sháng Ti* is; though they would admit that he rules in a smaller sphere.

Another objection to the use of *Ti* to render *Elohim* in the first commandment is, that, this term would not exclude from religious worship multitudes of Beings who now receive much the greater portion of the worship offered in China. The worship of the God of wealth, the God of the Kitchen, and a number of other deities, who are all called *Shin*, but never *Ti*, and who receive more worship in one month than *Sháng tí* does in a generation, would not be forbidden by this term. The First Commandment would if *Ti* be used to render *Elohim*, spend its whole strength upon, first the lawful liege Lord and Sovereign of this people, and next upon a few of the *Shin*, who have been entitled *Ti*; whilst ninety-nine hundredths of the false worship, practiced by the common people of the present day, would not in any manner be forbidden by the use of this term.

We intended, when we commenced writing, to have devoted a few paragraphs to the consideration of the phrases, *Sháng tí*, 上帝, and *T'ien ti*, 天帝; but our Essay has already been extended to such a length that we shall dismiss them with one remark.

If *Ti* be not the appellative name of God in Chinese, the addition of the qualifying word, "high," or "celestial," cannot make it so; indeed we suppose no one would maintain that either of these phrases is the appellative name of God in Chinese, and the use of *T'ien ti*, 天帝, "The celestial Ruler or Rulers," could only be advocated on the ground that it was a title of the chief God, which we have sufficiently answered in the first part of our Essay.

With a short *resumé* of our objections to the use of *Ti*, to render θεός, we shall conclude our remarks on this subject.

We object to the use of *Ti*: 1. That it is not the appellative name of God, or of any class of Beings either human or divine, but is a title given alike to gods and men. 2. That all the Dictionaries, both native and foreign, give Judge, or Ruler, as the meaning of *Ti*, whilst they give no intimation of its being the appellative name of God. 3. That meaning Ruler, and not God, it is wholly unsuitable to express the doctrine of the Trinity. 4. That *Ti* was never used even as the title of more than six Beings who were worshiped in the state religion, that *neither of the Six* was ever worshiped by *the people* of China, and that five of these six are now worshiped by no one. 5. That if *Ti* be used in the translation of the First Commandment it will forbid civil government; and 6. That it will not forbid ninety-nine hundredths of the false worship now offered in China.

These objections appear to us so weighty, direct and palpable, that all, who regard them as sustained, by the evidence we have adduced, will agree with us that the use of *Ti*, to render *Elohim* and θεός in the translation of the Sacred Scriptures, is wholly inadmissible.

We give a few additional texts of Scripture to show how subversive of civil government, the use of this word to render *Elohim* would prove. "I am the Lord and there is none else; there is no God beside me." Is 45:5. "Is there a God beside me? Yea, there is no God, I know not any." Is 44:8.

What would be thought of the English Translator who should use the word King as that whereby to render *Elohim*, into English, in the passages quoted above. And yet *King* is not more commonly used, nor more well known as the title of the Ruler of the English nation, than *Ti* is as the title of him who rules over the Chinese people. Should we render God, in the passages above cited, by a word which is constantly used to designate the individual who holds his office, *Tau Kwang* would surely have just cause of complaint; and who could wonder, if under such circumstances, he were to forbid the distribution of our books? Who could blame him if he did.

In conclusion, we have only to beg that the arguments, produced in favor of the use of the words *Shin* and *Ti*, respectively, may be carefully compared, that a right judgment may be formed which of these two words is in truth the appellative name of God in Chinese.

With respect to *Shin* we have seen, 1. That it is unquestionably

the name of a class of Beings to whom the Chinese have always offered and still offer religious worship. 2. That the *Shin* are the highest of the three classes of invisible Beings, whom the Chinese worship. 3. That the Being worshiped in the *Kiau* sacrifice (the highest ever offered in China) is the *T'ien Chi Shin* 天之神, "God of Heaven." 4. That this *T'ien chi Shin*, 天之神, is styled *Shang Ti*. 5. That *Shang Ti* is called repeatedly the most honorable of the *Shin*. 6. That Drs. Morrison and Medhurst, in their Dictionaries both give *Shin* as the appellative name of God in Chinese; and lastly, that all the Missionaries whether Protestants or Romanists, have used *Shin* in their writings as the appellative name of God, whilst none of them have ever used *Ti*.

This is an amount of positive testimony in favor of *Shin* being the appellative name of God in Chinese, which we risk nothing in saying, cannot be produced in favor of any other word in the language. Whatever objections, therefore, may be urged against the use of this word, must be answered by the exigencies of the case. *Shin*, is the only word the Chinese language affords us, that can be regarded, after a careful examination of the subject, as having any just claim to be considered the appellative name of God. This word we must therefore use to render *Elohim* and θεος *malgré* all objections. If we could remodel the literature of the country, we would forbid the employment of *Shin* as the Pantheists have used it, we would forbid its use for the human soul; but we must take the Chinese language as it is, and can only use the best terms it affords us, it being the only medium through which we can make the Chinese people acquainted with the Sacred Scriptures. That *Shin* is used for all objects of religious worship, including the manes of the dead, makes it only the more available to prohibit all false worship to which this people are addicted.

If the writer may judge from his own past experience, the objection which has had the greatest weight with the Missionaries, and prejudiced their minds most against the use of *Shin* for the true God, is the fact that it is used as the appellative name of a class including so many contemptible Deities, that it seems to them almost contamination to call Jehovah by a name that is common to such Beings.

This feeling is most natural, and can only be overcome by remembering that we use this common name to negative the existence of these contemptible and imaginary Deities. A Greek or Roman

Christian must have had the same feeling with respect to the use of θεός or *Deus*. There is no individual of the class called *Shin*, who is more insignificant than Priapus, or Sterentius, or Occator; not to descend lower into the Greek and Roman Pantheon.

The appellative name of God in use in each heathen nation must be used. The truths taught in the Bible can alone purify the language, as well as the hearts, of a heathen people.

The writer indulges a strong hope, that, as all the Missionaries have hitherto agreed in using *Shin*, to translate θεός when heathen gods were referred to, they will all ultimately be led to see the propriety of using this same word to render *Elohim* and θεός in all cases. The question is one of the utmost importance to the spread of the Gospel in China, and claims from all those connected with the missionary operations here the most prayerful and careful consideration.

May God of His infinite goodness grant wisdom and grace to the Directors of the Bible societies so to decide this question as shall be best for the interests of the Redeemer's cause, and for the salvation of the perishing millions in China, who are expecting the word of God from their hands.

Upon the Missionaries themselves however must rest the heaviest responsibility in this case; theirs is the chief anxiety, the warmest interest. May the gracious Saviour be present with them all, that the diversity of opinion which now exists on this vital point—the name by which we shall call Him for whom we claim the homage of all hearts in China—may not cause any breach of the harmony which has hitherto existed among the Protestant Missionaries in China.

The writer's constant prayer is that all those in China, "who do confess God's Holy name may agree in the truth of his holy word, and live in unity and godly love."

FINIS.

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every entry should be supported by a valid receipt or invoice. This ensures transparency and allows for easy verification of the data.

In the second section, the author outlines the various methods used to collect and analyze the data. This includes both primary and secondary data collection techniques. The primary data was gathered through direct observation and interviews with key stakeholders. Secondary data was obtained from existing reports and databases.

The analysis phase involved using statistical software to identify trends and correlations within the data. The results show a clear upward trend in the number of transactions over the period studied. This is attributed to several factors, including increased market activity and improved infrastructure.

The final section provides a summary of the findings and offers recommendations for future research. It suggests that further studies should focus on the long-term sustainability of the current trends and the impact of external factors on the data.



